

ADMINISTRATOR PERSPECTIVES OF MERIDIAN SCHOOL DISTRICT PTE  
MAGNET PROGRAMS, INSTRUCTORS, AND STUDENTS

A Thesis

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the

Degree of Master of Science

with a

Major in Agricultural Education

in the

College of Graduate Studies

University of Idaho

by

William Tady Schumaker

August 2014

Major Professor: Allison J. L. Touchstone, Ph.D.

## AUTHORIZATION TO SUBMIT THESIS

This thesis of William Tady Schumaker, submitted for the degree of Master of Science with a major in Agricultural Education and titled “Administrator Perspectives of Meridian School District PTE Magnet Programs, Instructors, and Students” has been reviewed in final form, as indicated by the signatures and dates given below. Permission is now granted to submit final copies to the College of Graduate Studies for approval.

Major  
Professor: \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_  
Allison J.L. Touchstone, Ph.D.

Committee  
Members: \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_  
Lou E. Riesenber, Ph.D.

\_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_  
John Cannon, Ph.D.

Department  
Administrator: \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_  
James J. Connors, Ph.D.

Discipline’s  
College Dean: \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_  
Larry Makus, Ph.D.

### Final Approval and Acceptance

Dean of the College  
of Graduate Studies: \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_  
Jie Chen, Ph.D.

## ABSTRACT

Although building and district administrators were key to the success of a professional-technical education (PTE) program, few quantitative studies had been conducted that specifically addressed administrator perspectives of PTE magnet programs. Magnet programs were becoming more prevalent in the state and country, but were limited in their number as compared to traditional PTE programs. As magnet programs continued to increase in popularity within the United States, the need for more in depth studies was evident. Additionally, magnet programs in Idaho had taken on a new light with the Idaho legislature implementing new guidelines and increased PTE funding within Idaho, school districts had begun to utilize magnet facilities to educate students in a whole new way (Gelber, 2008).

The purpose of this study was to describe the perceptions secondary administrators held of PTE programs, instructors and students within a magnet program. Because of the complexity of a PTE magnet program, it could be assumed these types of programs may be perceived by administrators to be ineffective (Kidwai, 2011). This study was designed to analyze the perspectives administrators had of PTE magnet programs within the Meridian School District. The study results showed administrators within the Meridian School District did believe these programs provide students with opportunities to be successful in any career they choose. Additionally, PTE magnet programs were perceived to be rigorous and beneficial for all students.

## VITA

### Education

- B.S. Agricultural Education, University of Idaho, Moscow, ID, 2008
- M.S. Agricultural Education, University of Idaho, Moscow, ID, 2014

### Certifications

- Idaho Standard Secondary

### Endorsements/HQT Status

- Agricultural Science and Technology
- Economics
- Biology
- K-12 Administration

### Awards & Achievements

- Donald & Ruth Benedict Scholarship (2006-2008)
- Vivian Lemon Scholarship (2005-2008)
- Western Idaho Fair Scholarship (2004-2008)
- Ada County Farm Bureau Scholarship (2004-2008)
- Idaho Academic Scholarship (2004-2008)
- Recipient of the National American FFA Degree (2005)
- Rick A. Dirksen Memorial Scholarship (2004)

### Organizations & Activities

- National Association of Agricultural Educators (2009-Present)
- Idaho Vocational Agricultural Teachers Association (2009-Present)
- Meridian Education Association (2009-Present)
- Idaho Education Association (2009-Present)
- University of Idaho Collegiate FFA Member (2005-2008)
- Member Meridian FFA Chapter (2000-2008)
- University of Idaho Collegiate Farm Bureau Member (2006-2008)
- University of Idaho Resident Assistant & House Director (2005-2007)
- College of Agricultural & Life Sciences Ambassador (2005-2006)

### Work Experience

- July 2009-Present, Agricultural Science And Technology. /FFA Advisor, Joint School Dist. #2, Teacher – Agriculture Magnet Program
- July 2008-May 2009, Environmental Business Promoter, Peace Corps Jamaica, Env. /Ag Ed.
- May 2007-June 2008, Landscape Technician, U of I, Facilities, Landscape Maintenance
- August 2005-May 2007, Office Assistant, U of I, AEE Department, Various Tasks
- May 2006-August 2006, Office Assistant, CM Company Inc, Various Tasks

## **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

This study would not be possible without the love and support of my wife. Her continual push for me to be better and to be successful in this endeavor has made this dream a reality. Additionally, the support of my family, specifically my Mom and Dad has always stressed the importance of education. In addition my major professor Dr. Touchstone and my committee members, Dr. Riesenber, and Dr. Cannon had provided me with guidance, insight, and suggestions about my research topic. Finally, without the responses from those individuals who were sampled, this study would not exist.

**LIST OF TABLES**

Table 1	
Administrators' Agreement with Statements about PTE Magnet Programs .....	25
Table 2	
Administrators' Agreement with Statements about Instructors in PTE Magnet Programs .....	28
Table 3	
Administrators' Agreement with Statements about Students in PTE Magnet Programs .....	30

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Authorization to Submit Thesis .....	ii
Abstract.....	iii
Vita .....	iv
Acknowledgements.....	v
List of Tables .....	vi
Table of Contents.....	vii
Chapter I. Introduction.....	1
Statement of the Problem.....	2
Purpose of the Study .....	3
Significance of the Study.....	3
Research Questions.....	4
Definitions .....	4
Summary .....	5
Chapter II. Review of Literature.....	6
Introduction.....	6
Definitions & Descriptions of PTE.....	6
Historical impact of PTE magnet programs .....	7
Purpose and implementation of PTE magnet programs .....	9
Impact of PTE magnet programs .....	10
Administrator perceptions of PTE magnet programs .....	11
Summary .....	12
Chapter III. Methodology .....	13
Population and Sample Selection .....	13
Research Approach .....	13
Limitations .....	14
Delimitations.....	14
Research Questions.....	15
Hypotheses.....	15
Data Collection Procedures and Instruments.....	16
Survey Instrument.....	16

Non-Response Threat and Generalizability .....	18
Analysis of Data .....	19
Summary .....	20
Chapter IV. Findings .....	21
Introduction.....	21
Analyses of Joint School District #2 Administrators (Total Population) .....	21
Survey Results .....	22
Research Questions.....	23
Administrators’ perspectives of PTE magnet programs .....	23
Administrators’ perspectives of PTE magnet program instructors.....	26
Administrators’ perspectives of PTE magnet program students .....	28
Summary .....	31
Chapter V. Results, Conclusions, Observations, and Recommendations.....	32
Population Demographics.....	32
Results & Conclusions Based on the Study.....	33
Research Questions.....	33
Administrators’ perspectives of PTE magnet programs .....	33
Administrators’ perspectives of PTE magnet program instructors.....	34
Administrators’ perspectives of PTE magnet program students .....	35
Observations Based on the Study .....	35
Recommendations for Future Study .....	36
References.....	38
Appendices .....	41
Appendix A: Instrument .....	41
Appendix B: Participant Invitation Letters & Permission Forms.....	50
Appendix C: Participant Notification E-mail & Follow Up E-mails .....	53
Appendix D: Institutional Review Board Submission & Approval .....	55
Appendix E: Human Subjects Certificates .....	64



## Chapter I

### INTRODUCTION

A school not limited by typical neighborhood lines with specific curriculum was commonly known as a magnet school or program (Gelber, 2008). Originally created to assist with de-segregating schools, magnet programs throughout the United States had been evident since the early 1960's, yet in Idaho in 2013, magnet programs were a fairly new concept, in which the perceived effectiveness and impact on students had not been studied (Alvarez, Graham, & Walker, 2014). The state of Idaho placed a great deal of emphasis on PTE magnet programs by provided an additional \$2,434,400 in additional magnet funding for fiscal year 2014 according to the Idaho State Department of Education (*Idaho division of professional-technical education annual report, 2013*). The need to understand how administrators perceive magnet programs in Idaho aligned itself with the need to understand if magnet programs were a long term solution to issues including funding, expenses related to capital intensive facilities, and the need for highly trained teachers in specialized areas (Fleming, 2012). Because magnet programs generally saved school districts money, more school districts across the nation, specifically within Idaho, were considering the utilization of a magnet school or program to cut costs and to increase overall efficiency (Fleming, 2012). Although magnet programs may have been useful in saving districts money, several questions had yet to be answered:

- Did administrators see this as enough of a positive to make the initial investment and to provide funding for student transportation to a facility from their home secondary school?

- Did it make fiscal sense to continue to encourage school districts to keep expensive PTE programs such as welding or collision repair?
- Did administrators believe PTE provided a long-term benefit for students?

### **Statement of the Problem**

At the time of this study, magnet programs within the state of Idaho were utilized in only 17 out of 115 (15%) school districts in Idaho according to the Idaho State Department of Education (*Idaho division of professional-technical education annual report, 2013*). Thus, it was unclear how administrators perceived the effectiveness of PTE magnet programs whose implementation was an increasing trend. The Meridian School District (MSD) located in Meridian, Idaho serves 384 square miles with a population of approximately 100,000 residents. The district includes 28 elementary schools (Kindergarten through sixth grades), three kindergarten through eighth grade schools, nine middle schools (grades sixth through eighth), five traditional secondary schools (grades nine through twelve based on geographical boundary, three alternative secondary schools, and one international baccalaureate secondary school (Exline, 2014). Because MSD encompasses a large geographic and densely populated area, it had become the largest school district in the state of Idaho serving nearly 36,000 pupils (Exline, 2014). MSD not only has PTE magnet programs, but also included additional magnet programs in the arts, music, dance, drama, visual arts, science, and math.

At the time of this study, there were twelve PTE magnet programs active in Joint School District #2 (MSD), with 20 PTE magnet instructors and 3,377 students enrolled in at least one PTE magnet course. According to the State Division of Professional-Technical Education (2012), PTE magnet programs in the state of Idaho had been funded with \$2,434,

400 in total state allocated magnet funding in addition to the \$10,260 in state added cost funding provided for each FTE (full time equivalent). Within MSD, the state had allocated approximately \$300,000 in additional magnet program funding. Due to the added incentive the state provides for funding a magnet program, the need to study administrator's perspectives of PTE magnet programs became increasingly important. Because the administration within the Meridian School District was actively involved in deciding the outcome of magnet programs within the district, it became imperative to understand the perception administrators held of professional-technical magnet programs.

### **Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study was to assess the value of capital, time and teachers in MSD PTE magnet programs and to describe administrator perceptions of student success. More specifically, the purpose of this study was to analyze administrator's perspectives of PTE magnet programs, instructors and students within Joint School District #2 (MSD) in Meridian, Idaho.

### **Significance of the Study**

The perceived effectiveness of PTE magnet programs was assessed and the MSD would use this information to chart a course of action, which will either continue to involve magnet facilities or begin phasing the programs out. The study could potentially be used by the state of Idaho and throughout the nation to determine the viability or value of magnet programs in other school districts. Additionally, school districts not currently utilizing the magnet model could use this study to determine the impact it could potentially have in their district.

## **Research Questions**

The following research questions were initially developed based on the purpose of the study and the statement of the problem. Furthermore the research questions are based on the review of literature found in chapter two.

1. What was the perspective of PTE magnet programs within Joint School District #2 by administrators from within the school district?
2. What was the perspective of PTE magnet program instructors within Joint School District #2 by administrators from within the school district?
3. What was the perspective of PTE magnet program students within Joint School District #2 by administrators from within the school district?

## **Definitions**

In order to have a clear understanding of the research project and objectives, multiple terms need to be understood and defined.

1. Association of Career Technical Education (ACTE) – The professional organization for Career Technical professionals (Mason, 2012).
2. Career and Technical Education (CTE) – The term used nationally to identify educational training programs to prepare students for a technical career outside of secondary school (Mason, 2012).
3. Completer – PTE term describing PTE students who complete a full pathway or POS within a PTE program (Schwarz, 2012).
4. Full Time Equivalent (FTE) – The term used by school districts and the State Department of Education to indicate one full time instructor employed for one fiscal year (Schwarz, 2012).

5. Joint School District #2 (MSD) – School district serving Southwestern Idaho in the Boise & Meridian area often referred to as Meridian School District (Exline, 2014).
6. Magnet Program – referred to schools whose curricula were linked to thematic or content specific subject matter and whose enrollments remained unbound by neighborhood lines (Fleming, 2012).
7. Pathway – PTE term describing a program of courses emphasizing in one area and an informal term for a POS (Program of Study) (Schwarz, 2012).
8. Professional-Technical Education (PTE) –The term used by Idaho agencies and institutions to describe career and technical education. Interchangeable with CTE (Schwarz, 2012).
9. Program of Study (POS) – PTE term describing a specific career pathway of courses emphasizing in one area for example Welding, Masonry, Engineering etc. (Schwarz, 2012).
10. Vocational education (Voc. Ed.) - Historic term used for current Career and Technical Education (CTE) (Schwarz, 2012).

### **Summary**

Prior to this study, the perception of magnet programs throughout Idaho, and specifically the Meridian School District had not been described. It became imperative to determine if magnet programs were an impactful use of state and district resources. MSD being the largest district within the state of Idaho and with their full utilization of magnet programs as an educational opportunity for students, a study within the district to determine administrator’s perspectives was obvious. Administrators were now able to utilize the results of the study to enrich the learning environment for students throughout the district.

## **Chapter II**

### **REVIEW OF LITERATURE**

#### **Introduction**

The overall themes of current literature regarding both administrators and PTE programs nationwide included:

1. Definitions and descriptions of career and technical education (CTE) or professional-technical education (PTE) programs.
2. Historical impact of PTE magnet programs on students and school districts.
3. Purpose and implementation of PTE magnet programs.
4. Impact of PTE magnet programs on students and school districts.
5. Administrator perceptions of PTE magnet programs.

#### **Definitions and descriptions of career and technical education (CTE) or professional-technical education (PTE) programs.**

Career and Technical Education (CTE), also known in Idaho as Professional-Technical Education (PTE) and formally known around the country as Vocational Education (Voc. Ed.), was designed as a secondary and post-secondary educational program with the goal to educate students to directly enter the workforce out of a secondary school or with little training at the post-secondary level (Gordon, 2008; Schwarz, 2012). The goal of PTE in secondary education was to provide students with a "...portable, stackable credential that can be pursued after secondary school at the postsecondary level..." (Schwarz, 2012). The Association of Career and Technical Education (2012) estimated 12 million students participated in CTE programs nationwide with most students participating in at least one CTE course. Typically, students enrolling in CTE courses tended to be those planning to go

on to be trained and skilled workers in the workforce (Schwarz, 2012). According to the Idaho State Department of Education (2012), 63% of PTE secondary school completers enroll in post-secondary education compared to 45.7% of the general secondary school population attending post-secondary training including college. This difference could be attributed to students enrolling in CTE/PTE courses.

### **Historical impact of PTE magnet programs on students and school districts.**

Over the past 25 years, general public perceptions of PTE had shifted from a belief PTE was for the non-traditional or non-academic student to “the academic and college bound student”. PTE was not only for students headed directly into the workforce, additionally the trend had become for students of all backgrounds to utilize PTE courses to build job skills. Due to this shift, the approach to effective PTE instruction also changed (Bifulco, Cobb, & Bell, 2009). Consequently, policy makers were more willing to take a deeper look at the benefits of PTE for students. Park, Pearson, & Sawyer (2011) noted administrators viewed PTE in a more positive light, meaning PTE was viewed as a viable option to prepare all students for their future career. Administrators also began to see the benefit of using PTE for training students to enter the work force with limited or minimal training directly from secondary school (Park, et. al, 2011).

From the early fifties through the 1980s, CTE progressed minimally and maintained a negative image for many administrators. In fact, PTE was perceived to target students that would “never move on in life” to attain a college degree or any advanced training what so ever (Park, et. al, 2011). These students were the ones that would go on to fill the manufacturing jobs of the country or even construction workers (Alvarez, Graham, & Walker, 2014). PTE students were not thought to be the type of student to go on to college

or further their education. In fact, PTE was at one point the area of the school that students would go to ‘goof off’ (Park, et. al., 2011). It was perceived to be the least academic area of the school environment. “Real teaching” did not take place here, it was just an area for students to take advantage of a shop environment where they could work with their hands. PTE was never thought of as an academic reference point for students in the public education systems (Park, et. al., 2011; Gelber, 2008).

The Clark Magnet School in California made a particular effort to change the perception of PTE by providing students with specific training and emphasizing the use of PTE to provide students with hands on skills allowing students to enter the workforce highly trained with truly usable skills (Newcomer & Seaton, 2007). The use of a “student-centered culture and high academic expectations” was imperative. The difference at Clark County Magnet Secondary School, however, was students were expected to achieve high academic standards while also focusing on their training for technical careers after secondary school. This approach, provided students with a well-rounded education, which was perceived by community members to be a rigorous and meaningful education, counteracting the negative perception of professional-technical education. This dual focus on a statewide level was also evidenced in Idaho, where PTE courses may be used to meet secondary and post-secondary school graduation requirements in math, science, and economics (Schwarz, 2012).

The programmatic transition from preparing students specifically for vocational careers to making the move beyond secondary school to a career was front and center in the modern change of PTE. Thus, the transition from general PTE courses to a PTE magnet program began as student enrollment in magnet schools throughout the United States,



according to the National Center for Education Statistics, as of the 2008-09 school year was higher in comparison to charter schools (Fleming, 2012). Newcomer and Seaton (2007) stated by placing a greater emphasis on providing students with a specific skill after secondary school in addition to providing every student with a high level of technological competence students would be provided with the skills necessary to be competitive in industry. In Montgomery, Alabama, students received specific medical training they would normally pay for in a college program, rather, they were provided the opportunity to take courses to advance their careers in a high school PTE setting (Jackson, 2014).

### **Purpose and implementation of PTE magnet programs.**

Magnet programs were initially made popular because they provided parents and students with true school choice (Archbald, 1999). From a school district's perspective, it not only provided a choice to parents and students, but magnet programs also provided the district the opportunity to combine and specialize in specific program areas. For example, a magnet program specializing in welding within a district may benefit by building one specialized facility to service an entire district (Fleming, 2012). A school in Portland, Oregon was utilizing PTE magnet programs to provide students with professional-technical skills they wouldn't normally acquire from a typical classroom setting (Alvarez, Graham, & Walker, 2014). Districts could utilize PTE magnet programs to save money by building one facility and hiring specialty teachers similar to what schools throughout the country have done (Alvarez, Graham, & Walker, 2014). However, cost savings was often balanced with the long-term cost of transporting students to magnet facilities. The question of school choice when districts considered magnet programs was often the major reason why a district decided for implementation (Fleming, 2012). Within the Meridian School District, a student

could choose between three different PTE magnet facilities: the Meridian Professional-Technical Center, Ada Professional-Technical Center, and the Dehryl A. Dennis Technical-Education Center (Low, 2012). Each facility provides students throughout the district the opportunity to choose specific PTE programs of study (POS) in a specific program area (Low, 2012). The Meridian School District offered magnet programs in agriculture and natural resources, engineering, family and consumer sciences, health professions, and building trades, allowing a student to choose from among fourteen different pathways. Within the state of Idaho, 17 different school districts operated magnet programs and received state funding, or they had filed to have a magnet program at the time of this study. Low (2012) and Archbald (1999) agreed that the major reason for magnet programs has consistently evolved around school choice.

#### **Impact of PTE magnet programs on students and school districts**

The purpose of magnet school programs throughout the United States was to provide a choice for parents and students (Fleming, 2012). Secondly, it was a more effective way for districts to manage their resources. Yet, what impact did magnet programs truly have on the education system?

The Boston area school system decided to approach schools in a different way, in which de-segregation would be the focus of their magnet school and program (Gelber, 2008). The magnet facility forced parents to cross racial bounds and it helped the Boston area to transition into a racially accepted area. The idea of a magnet program in this scenario was not used specifically for PTE, rather it was used to bring students of different races together. In fact, the magnet facility changed the perceptions of the community and the area schools. This was one example in which magnet schools had truly impacted

communities. Additionally, schools in Connecticut utilized magnet schools to provide students and parents with a choice based educational system (Bifulco, Cobb, & Bell, 2009). Magnet programs had not only allowed school districts to approach education in a whole new way, they also provided an opportunity for school districts to organize expensive programs in one area while also providing students and parents with a choice in their education.

### **Administrator perceptions of PTE magnet programs.**

Administrators' perspectives of PTE in general had seemingly been similar to the public's opinion. At the time of this study administrators viewed PTE in a more positive light than in the 1980s and were also seeing the overall benefit of using PTE for students not planning on attending college and would like to enter the work force with limited or minimal training (Kidwai, 2011; Riesenber, & Lierman, 1990). Although, Kidwai (2011) also noted while CTE was changing, the perception of CTE/PTE was not. The general public, policymakers including administration, and the media had a misconception of the effectiveness, rigor and even the relevance of CTE courses within the United States. A stigma had been associated with CTE being the domain for students not going into four-year college programs (Parke, et. al., 2011). Additionally, policymakers hold a variety of misconceptions of CTE, including that CTE was on the decline (Kidwai, 2011; Jackson, 2014). From 1999 to 2008, the number of students taking CTE courses nationally increased from 9.6 million to 14.4 million. Although the perceptions the general public, (Kidwai, 2011) policymakers, and the media had of CTE had been studied, perceptions of the administrators who oversee PTE magnet programs was conspicuously missing.

### **Summary**

Not only was it imperative to understand the positive benefits of PTE, it was also vital to realize magnet programs within Idaho and MSD were a realistic and pertinent solution to allow the community to change their perspective of PTE. Throughout the country, it has taken thirty years for school districts to realize the importance of PTE within the school system. Not only can PTE provide students with vital skills usable within the workplace, districts can also utilize PTE to re-enforce basic technical skills and reading, writing, math, economics and even science. Research has shown PTE in the United States was not perceived to be rigorous or for college bound students (Bifuco, Cobb, & Bell, 2009; Alvarez, Graham, & Walker, 2014). Although, research has also shown policymakers, school administrators, parents, and the general public were beginning to realize PTE could be an integral and vital part of the educational system (Kidwai, 2011).

## **Chapter III**

### **METHODOLOGY**

#### **Population and Sample Selection**

The Meridian School District served over 36,000 pupils in the state of Idaho (Exline, 2014). The district also had the most active magnet programs in the State of Idaho at the time of the study, allowing for a population of administrators with the same district policies and the same magnet programs for their students to choose from. This study focused on administrators within the unique Joint School District #2 (MSD) in Meridian, Idaho, because there were twelve PTE magnet programs serving the entire school district with a total of 20 magnet program instructors, and 3,377 non-duplicated students enrolled in a PTE magnet program area course within MSD (Low, 2013). The target population within the district was purposefully selected to include thirty-eight administrators selected from a total of forty-three secondary administrators including district secondary school principals and assistant-principals, district PTE and magnet program coordinators, as well as four district area coordinators, assistant superintendent and superintendent. The participants were identified through purposeful selection and encompassed all administrative roles within the school district. All of the 43 secondary district administrators work either directly or indirectly with students who were enrolled in a magnet program course.

#### **Research Approach**

An online survey was used to gather perspectives and input from administrators. This approach not only allowed for insightful input from administrators, it also allowed for the researcher to analyze the information gathered from the questions of the surveys designed with Likert-type scaled response categories (Leedy, & Ormrod, 2010). A

quantitative research method was chosen because of the ability to get specific and accurate data on administrator's perceptions of PTE magnet programs (Creswell, 2013).

Additionally, the survey format allowed for open-ended responses as well.

### **Limitations**

Creswell (2013) defined limitations of a student as the "potential weaknesses or problems with the study identified by the researcher" (p. 207). The following limitations were identified:

1. The population was limited to administrators from a single school district within the state of Idaho.
2. Because the study was focused on opinions and perspectives, the study was vulnerable to participant bias.
3. The researcher was a Professional-Technical Education instructor in a magnet program within the district studied. However, the researcher had the goal of providing factual and objective information throughout the study.
4. The information from this study was provided to the Meridian Joint School District #2 (MSD) for the purpose of administrator education and training as well as an evaluative tool for directing future district decisions.

### **Delimitations**

Delimitations were defined as the "restrictions that researchers impose in order to narrow the scope of a study" (Charles, 1998). For the purposes of this study, the following delimitations were identified:

1. The population of the study was delimited to administrators related to PTE magnet programs within Joint School District #2 (MSD).

2. The population of the study was further delimited to secondary school administrators and district level administrators within the Meridian School District not including elementary and middle school administrators. These limitations were in place because there were no PTE magnet programs available to elementary or middle schools within Joint School District #2 (MSD).
3. The data of the study was delimited to participant responses from the web-based survey.

### **Research Questions**

Based on the review of the literature and the purpose of the study, the following research questions were identified in regard to this study:

1. What was the perspective of PTE magnet programs within Joint School District #2 by administrators from within the school district?
2. What was the perspective of PTE magnet program instructors within Joint School District #2 by administrators from within the school district?
3. What was the perspective of PTE magnet program students within Joint School District #2 by administrators from within the school district?

### **Hypotheses**

1. Administrators perceive no value of PTE magnet programs within the school and district.
2. Administrators perceive no viable role of PTE magnet programs within the school and district.
3. Administrators perceive no differences between PTE magnet and traditional secondary school PTE programs.

4. Administrators perceive PTE students to be of lower quality in comparison to other non-PTE students within the district.
5. Administrators perceive PTE instructors to be a lower quality instructor in comparison to a general education instructor.

### **Data Collection Procedures & Instruments**

The survey instrument developed by the researcher was sent out to administrators specifically within Joint School District #2 (MSD). After the surveys were returned the results were analyzed. The information gained from the surveys provided a detailed amount of tangible information that provided a specific answer to the research questions (Cannon, Kitchell, & Duncan, 2010).

### **Survey Instrument**

The survey instrument was based on an instrument previously developed and used to target the research questions presented and the instrument was modified from its original form to fit the research study questions and purpose (Cannon, Kitchel, & Duncan, 2010). Likert-type scale, open ended, and selection from a list of options were the types of questions used in the survey.

The survey was divided into three equally important sections pertaining to: programs, instructors and students within PTE programs. By categorizing the questions within the survey, the researcher was better able to gather specific feedback from administrators as to their perception of PTE magnet programs within the school district.

The study was also reviewed for validity and reliability through an assessment by several researchers currently in the PTE field. Creswell (2013) suggests using peer review or debriefing to check for validation. The researcher debriefed with a peer in the field of



PTE at the collegiate level to assure the survey results were truly valid. Creswell (2013) also emphasizes the need for reliability in a study, suggesting the use of multiple coders to analyze and synthesize the data. The researcher utilized a faculty member in agricultural education as the secondary decoder to assist with decoding the results and assuring the results were analyzed with a clear perspective assuring the studies reliability and validity. Creswell (2013) also defined generalizability as the scope of the study either broad or narrow in scope. In this study, the research was limited to one school district within the state of Idaho, by limiting or narrowing the population of the research study to one school district instead of all school districts, the generalizability of the study may be limited. Yet, the study was general enough to encompass a large majority of administrators within Joint School District #2 (MSD). Limiting the population of the study may decrease generalizability when discussing the true perspective of magnet programs within the state of Idaho. Although, limiting the study to the largest school district within the state of Idaho allows the study to be specific and provides some insight into the true perspectives of PTE programs and provided a basis for future research (Charles, 1998).

Of the 53 secondary and district administrators, 38 (72%,  $n=53$ ) were purposefully selected to participate in the study. Participants were selected based on their perceived familiarity with and access to students and instructors who attend a PTE magnet school. Additionally, any administrators who dealt directly with policies and/or decisions affecting PTE magnet programs were also invited to participate in the survey. Some administrators were not invited to participate in the survey because they did not have direct duties related to PTE magnet programs, instructors and/or students. In the end, 19 of the 38 (50%) invitees completed the survey, or partially completed the survey, which was consistent with the

recent response rate from Idaho administrators of 50% found by Cannon, Kitchel, Tenuto, and Joki (2012) but inconsistent with the 97% response rate from Idaho administrators in 1990 (Lierman, & Riesenber, 1990). In order to attempt to increase the response rate to closer to 100%, 5 contacts were made via email as well as personal phone calls to the invitees.

### **Non-Response Threat and Generalizability**

A total of 19 administrators of a population of 38 completed the survey for a response rate of the total population of 50%. Non-response error can be a threat to the external validity of a study anytime the response rate was below 100%. To account for non-response, early and late responders were compared for statistical differences in overall responses to survey questions (Lindner, Murphy, & Briers, 2001). Late responders were defined as the later 50% of the respondents (Lindner, et. al, 2001). The 0.05 level of significance was established *a priori* when comparing the two groups.

When comparing late and early responders, it was determined non-response error did not have to be a concern because the respondents were consistently less than 4 standard deviations from the mean. The responses from early and late responders were compared for all questions in the survey, no significant differences were identified ( $\chi^2$  Low 0.073 to  $\chi^2$  high 0.871) among response groups. Based on the Chi-Square values calculated comparing early responders and late responders as well as comparing demographics between the total population and the final sample, the non-response error has been dealt with and the threat to external validity has been minimized (Lidner, et. al, 2001). The results of the study will be generalizable to the target population based on the minimal difference between early and

late respondents and no statistically significant demographic difference between the total population and the final sample.

### **Analysis of Data**

Primarily, quantitative data analyses were used in the majority of the survey questions. The survey gathered basic demographic data and was then separated based on the research questions for this study:

1. What was the perspective of PTE magnet programs within Joint School District #2 by administrators from within the school district?
2. What was the perspective of PTE magnet program instructors within Joint School District #2 by administrators from within the school district?
3. What was the perspective of PTE magnet program students within Joint School District #2 by administrators from within the school district?

At the end of each survey section, respondents were given the option to provide open-ended responses which were qualitative in nature and allowed the respondents to express any additional perspective of PTE magnet programs, instructors, and students that may had not been clearly addressed elsewhere in the survey.

Additionally, the researcher identified major themes relating to each research question and based on the review of literature. The themes were as follows:

1. What was the perspective of PTE magnet programs within Joint School District #2 by administrators from within the school district?
  - a. Administrators' perspectives of the type of students enrolled in a PTE magnet program.
  - b. Administrators' perspectives of magnet programs in general.

2. What was the perspective of PTE magnet program instructors within Joint School District #2 by administrators from within the school district?
  - a. Administrators' perspectives of the level of training or education a PTE magnet instructor possesses.
  - b. Administrators' perspectives of PTE magnet instructor's involvement in the school and/or community.
  
3. What was the perspective of PTE magnet program students within Joint School District #2 by administrators from within the school district?
  - a. Administrators' perspectives of PTE magnet student's academic skills and abilities.
  - b. Administrators' perspectives of PTE magnet student's goals.
  - c. Administrators' perspectives of PTE student's social belonging to the school and/or community.

### **Summary**

This study used a quantitative survey research design following a Likert type scale to determine perspectives administrators had of PTE magnet programs within Joint School District #2 (MSD). The survey was divided into three separate but equally important parts analyzing administrator's perspectives of PTE magnet programs, instructors and students. Additionally, the survey questions were further divided into sub-parts questioning administrator's perspectives on topics such as their perspective of students academic skills and abilities or instructors training and education. Participants were selected from secondary school administrators and district administrators limited to Joint School District #2 in Meridian, Idaho. The study was tested for validity, reliability and non-response error.

## **Chapter IV**

### **FINDINGS**

#### **Introduction**

The purpose of this study was to assess the value of capital, time and teachers in MSD PTE magnet programs and to describe administrators' perceptions of student success. The researcher adapted a series of research questions to probe administrators' perception of PTE magnet programs, instructors and students within MSD (Cannon, Kitchel, & Duncan 2012). The survey was conducted beginning in November of 2013 and concluded January of 2014. Each of the questions was analyzed using quantitative and some qualitative analyses were appropriate. An administrator from each secondary school in the district was selected; the superintendent, the assistant superintendent, area directors and PTE district administrative staff were also invited to participate in the survey for a total population of 38. Of the 38 invitees, 19 (50%) completed the survey or partially completed the survey.

#### **Analyses of Joint School District #2 Administrators (Total Population)**

At the time of this study within Joint School District #2, there were nine secondary school building principals, 34 assistant principals. Of the 43 secondary school building administrators, 30% were females (n=43), 70% were male (n=43), and 34 of the 43 (79%) were between the ages of 30 and 50, while 9 of the 43 (21%) were over the age of 50 years of age according to Joint School District #2 human resources department (Leeds, 2014). Of the 19 participants in the survey, 12 (63%) were male and 7 (37%) were female. In addition to the secondary school building administrators as a part of the district's administrative ladder, the survey was also sent to the Superintendent, Assistant Superintendent, four district area coordinators, the director of district PTE, assistant PTE director, and the special

projects coordinator for PTE. Of the 52 total secondary and district administrators, 38 (73%, n=52) were selected to invite to participate in the study. Participants were selected based on their access and duties pertaining to instructors and students who attend a PTE magnet school. Additionally, any administrators who directly make policies and/or decisions effecting PTE magnet programs were invited to participate in the survey. Some administrators were not invited to participate in the survey because they did not have direct duties related to PTE magnet programs, instructors and/or students. Finally, 19 of the 38 (50%) invitees completed the survey or partially completed the survey, while 15 or 16 respondents completed each survey question noted in the summary of survey results in Table 1, Table 2, and Table 3.

### **Survey Results**

The data collected from the surveys was analyzed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 22 and Microsoft Excel. The survey utilized a Likert-type scale ranging from 0% to 100%. If the respondent selected zero it meant they did not feel the survey question described a PTE program, instructor or student. If the respondent selected 100% it implied by their response, they agreed completely with the statement and its reflection of PTE magnet programs, instructors and students. Respondents were provided a scale broken into 10% increments (0%, 1-10%, 11-20%, 21-30%, 31-40%, 41-50%, 51-60%, 61-70%, 71-80%, 81-90%, 91-100%). In order for the researcher to further analyze the data, the Likert-type scale was coded as follows: 0% = 1, 1-10% = 2, 11-20% = 3, 21-30%=4, 31-40% = 5, 41-50% = 6, 51-60% = 7, 61-70% = 8, 71-80% = 9, 81-90% = 10, 91-100% = 11. The additional coding allowed for descriptive analyses to be conducted more readily to describe tendencies of responses from the participants. Participants were also

given the option to respond to open-ended questions at the end of each section of the survey, providing for further insight into the perspectives of administrators in the Meridian School District.

### **Research Questions**

After an analysis of the current research available on administrators' perspectives of PTE magnet programs, it became apparent perspectives administrators held of PTE magnet programs had not been studied in any depth. From the review of literature the following research questions were developed:

1. What was the perspective of PTE magnet programs within Joint School District #2 by administrators from within the school district?
2. What was the perspective of PTE magnet program instructors within Joint School District #2 by administrators from within the school district?
3. What was the perspective of PTE magnet program students within Joint School District #2 by administrators from within the school district?

#### **Research Question #1: Administrators' perspectives of PTE magnet programs**

Administrators were asked about their personal perspectives of PTE magnet programs. Question 52-69 of the survey asked administrators specifically about their perspective of PTE magnet programs (Appendix A). Respondents were given a Likert-type response scale ranging from 0-100% and were asked to select the range they felt best matched with their perspective of PTE magnet programs. Respondents were also given the opportunity to add comments in an open-ended question about PTE magnet programs.

The majority (80%,  $n=12$ ) of administrators within MSD indicated they perceived PTE magnet programs to be for students with above average intelligence who will enter a

high wage, high skill career ( $\bar{X} = 7.3$ ). Additionally, 60% ( $n=9$ ) agreed that PTE students were college bound ( $\bar{X} = 7.9$ ). All of the respondents to this question (100%,  $n=15$ ) believed magnet programs were for students who work well with their hands ( $\bar{X} = 6.5$ ), while 80% ( $n=12$ ) of administrators indicated PTE students generally did not come from blue-collar homes or backgrounds ( $\bar{X} = 5.7$ ). Additionally, 80% ( $n=12$ ) of respondents perceived that magnet programs were for the development of academic and non-academic students alike, not just the student who did not perform well in the basic skill areas ( $\bar{X} = 4.9$ ).

Survey results indicated 100% ( $n=15$ ) of administrators believed PTE programs were expensive to maintain and operate ( $\bar{X} = 9.9$ ). However, 100% ( $n=15$ ) of administrators responding indicated PTE programs prepare students for a meaningful and seamless transition to a high demand career ( $\bar{X} = 2.9$ ). When administrators were asked if they felt PTE programs were isolated from the rest of the school, seven (47%) of the 15 respondents felt this was true of 50% or less of PTE programs, while 8 (53%) respondents believed this described 51% or more of PTE programs ( $\bar{X} = 5.7$ ). Even though some administrators indicated they felt PTE programs could tend to be isolated, 100% ( $n=15$ ) of administrators said they would not describe PTE programs within MSD as outdated or remedial in nature ( $\bar{X} = 2.5$ ). Administrators (100%,  $n=15$ ) also indicated agreement that PTE programs were a good return on investment ( $\bar{X} = 9.7$ ). The response counts and percentages are reported in Table 1.



Table 1. Administrators' agreement with statements regarding PTE magnet programs

Statements	Agreement Scale											Response <i>n</i>	Mean Score	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11			
All students can benefit.							2	2	2	9			15	10.1
Expensive to maintain.							1	1	2	5	6		15	9.9
Good job of preparing people for meaningful employment.							1	1	3	5	5		15	9.8
Good return on investment.							2	1	3	2	7		15	9.7
Seamless transition to employment.							2	4	7		2		15	8.7
Provides for the education of the whole person.	1			1		1	1	1	2	5	3		15	8.5
Strong association with Idaho's learning achievement standards.			1		1	1	2	2	2	1	4		14	8.3
For college bound students.					1	5		3	3	1	2		15	7.9
For students who have above average intelligence.	1		1			3	3	3		2	2		15	7.3
For students who plan to enter high skill/high wage occupations.	1		1	1		3	1	2	2	3	1		15	7.2
Better suited for students who work well with their hands.	2		1	1		3	2	1	3	1	1		15	6.5
Enrollment is typically comprised of students with a bluecollar or agricultural background.	1		1	2		8	1		1	1			15	5.7
Isolated from the rest of the school.	2	2	1	1	1	1	2	1	2		2		15	5.7
For students who do not perform well in the basic skill areas.	2	2	3	1	1	1	2	1		1	1		15	4.9
Remedial in nature.	4	3	5		1		2						15	2.9
Focused on occupations that aren't in demand.	6	5	1				2			1			15	2.9
Outdated.	6	5	1		1	1	1						15	2.5

\*Indicates number of respondents or responses.

Administrators were also given the opportunity to provide any additional descriptors of PTE magnet programs within the District. The open-ended question allowed respondents to make statements referencing their additional perspectives of PTE magnet programs. The following statements were provided in participants' survey responses:

1. Scheduling was complicated due to various sites and programs.
2. PTE programs were rigid in their offerings because of system issues, for example FTE (Full Time Equivalent), travel, and time.
3. The PTE program was infused in our system and didn't feel separate from our core instruction.

**Research Question #2: Administrators' perspectives of PTE magnet program  
instructors**

Administrators were also asked about their personal perspectives of PTE magnet program instructors (Appendix A). When administrators were asked if they perceived instructors currently possessed a baccalaureate or masters degree, 80% ( $n=12$ ) of administrators indicated that they believed 81% or more PTE magnet program instructors had a baccalaureate degree ( $\bar{X} = 10.4$ ), while nine (60%) administrators responding to the survey indicated they believed only 51% of the PTE magnet program instructors possessed a masters degree ( $\bar{X} = 7.1$ ). Furthermore, when asked if instructors had some formal training in the area they currently teach in 84% ( $n=13$ ) of respondents indicated they believed 41% or more of the PTE magnet program instructors had some formal training or on-the-job experience ( $\bar{X} = 9.8$ ). Administrators were also asked about their perceptions of the intelligence of PTE instructors, and 68% ( $n=10$ ) indicated they perceived that 51% or more of the PTE magnet program instructors had above average intelligence ( $\bar{X} = 8.7$ ).

Concerning the PTE magnet program instructors' involvement in the social aspect and extracurricular activities of the MSD school community, administrators 58% ( $n=9$ ) indicated that they perceived less than 51% of PTE magnet program instructors were involved in extracurricular activities ( $\bar{X} = 4.5$ ), however 67% ( $n=10$ ) of the administrators indicated that they believed 61% or more of the PTE magnet program instructors were involved in the social aspect of the school community ( $\bar{X} = 7.8$ ). Survey results also indicated 86% ( $n=12$ ) of the administrators believed the PTE magnet program instructors exemplified what their school stands for ( $\bar{X} = 8.8$ ), while 71% ( $n=10$ ) of administrators indicated they believed PTE magnet program instructors were leaders within the school ( $\bar{X} = 7.4$ ) and had a similar status to other teachers within the school ( $\bar{X} = 2.9$ ). The response counts and percentages are recorded in Table 2.

Administrators were also given the opportunity to provide any additional descriptors of PTE magnet program instructors within the Meridian School District. The following were the only statements included in participants' survey responses:

1. PTE magnet program instructors were great with kids.
2. PTE magnet program instructors had a sense for community service.

*Table 2. Administrators' agreement with statements regarding instructors in PTE magnet programs.*

Statements	Agreement Scale											Response <i>n</i>	Mean Score
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		
Possess a bachelor's degree.					*1					4	11	16	10.4
Formal training in pedagogy.						1	1	3	5	6		16	9.8
A lot of on the job experience.						2	1	1	8	4		16	9.5
Good with concrete concepts.	1					1		3	4	6		15	9.3
More of practitioners than theorists.							2	2	5	6	1	16	9.1
Exemplify what his/her school stands for.	1					1	1	1	4	1	5	14	8.8
Above average in intelligence.	1					1	2	2	1	4	4	15	8.7
Interested in the social aspects of school.	1			2		2	1	4	3	2		15	7.8
Leaders in the school.	1			2	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	14	7.4
Possess a master's degree.			3	1		2	1	3	1	3	1	15	7.1
Not involved in the school's extracurricular activities.	4	1	2	1		3	1	1	1	1		15	4.5
Would be perceived as having a lower status by other teachers.	8	3				1	1	1	1			15	2.9

\*Indicates number of respondents or responses.

### **Research Question #3: Administrators' perspectives of PTE magnet program students**

The survey questions regarding PTE magnet program students were divided into three general categories: administrator's perspectives of PTE magnet program students, their academic skills and abilities, their goals in life, in addition to how the student fits into the school socially (Appendix A). The majority of respondents, 56% ( $n=9$ ) indicated they believed 51% or more of PTE magnet program students had above average intelligence ( $\bar{X} = 6.4$ ), were good with concrete concepts ( $\bar{X} = 8.2$ ), and had no trouble understanding abstract concepts ( $\bar{X} = 5.3$ ). Additionally, 81% ( $n=13$ ) of respondents perceived PTE magnet program students to be ranked in the top 2/3 of their academic classes ( $\bar{X} = 4.6$ ). Administrators also believed PTE magnet program students value their high school

education ( $\bar{X} = 8.0$ ), in fact, 75% ( $n=12$ ) of administrators believed 61% or more of the PTE magnet program students considered grades to be of importance ( $\bar{X} = 7.8$ ), PTE magnet program students enjoy non-academic classes as much as they enjoy academic classes ( $\bar{X} = 7.6$ ), and PTE magnet program students were not bored with school ( $\bar{X} = 3.9$ ).

Perceptions regarding PTE magnet program student goals and interests in life were also assessed. Fourteen (88%) respondents perceived PTE magnet program students to be interested in life and believed their high school career was important to their life success ( $\bar{X} = 8.7$ ). In addition, 63% ( $n=10$ ) of administrators indicated they perceived more than 51% of PTE magnet program students knew what they wanted from life and even planned to attend a four-year college ( $\bar{X} = 7.0$ ). Sixty-nine percent ( $n=11$ ) of respondents believed PTE magnet program students were confident about their future career choice ( $\bar{X} = 7.0$ ).

Lastly, administrators were asked to indicate their perception of how PTE students fit socially into their school community. The survey results show 94% ( $n=15$ ) of administrators perceived PTE magnet program students to be fun to be around ( $\bar{X} = 8.7$ ) while 88% ( $n=14$ ) believed PTE magnet program students were well liked by their classmates ( $\bar{X} = 8.7$ ) and were interested in the social aspects of the school ( $\bar{X} = 8.2$ ) and 69% ( $n=11$ ) of the administrators indicated they believed PTE students exemplified what their school stands for ( $\bar{X} = 7.1$ ). The survey results indicated 56% ( $n=9$ ) of the respondents believed 50% or less of PTE magnet program students were easily influenced by their peers ( $\bar{X} = 5.6$ ). The PTE magnet program students were also not perceived to care about fashion or dress or to have a lower social status by other students in the school ( $\bar{X} = 5.9$ ). The response counts and percentages are recorded in Table 3.

*Table 3. Administrators' agreement with statements about students enrolled in PTE magnet programs.*

Statements	Agreement Scale											Response <i>n</i>	Mean Score
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		
Interested in life.	*			1				3	3	5	3	16	8.7
Fun to be around.	1						2	3	4	2	4	16	8.7
Well liked by his/her classmates.	1					1		1	7	3	2	15	8.7
Interested in the social aspects of school.	1					1	2	3	3	4	1	15	8.2
Motivated in school by a sense of accomplishment.	1					2	2	2	3	5	1	16	8.2
Good with concrete concepts.	1				1	1	1	2	5	4	1	16	8.2
High school career is important.		1			1	1	1	4	4	4		16	8.0
Consider grades important.	1		1		2			2	6	3	1	16	7.8
Respect for all teachers.	1		1	1		2	1	1	2	6	1	16	7.8
High school as a means of achieving life's goals.			1		1	3	3		5	3		16	7.6
Self-confident.	1			1		2	3	1	6	1	1	16	7.6
Enjoy nonacademic classes more than academic classes.	1			2		2		3	4	4		16	7.6
Exemplify what his or her school stands for.	1	3			1			3	3	4	1	16	7.1
Sure about his/her future career choice.			1	2		2	4	2	5			16	7.0
Know what he/she wants from life.		1	1		2	2	2	2	2	3		15	7.0
Plans to attend a four year college.				3	1	2	1	8		1		16	6.9
Interested in how others feel about him/her.	1		1	2	1	2	1	3		2	2	15	6.8
Motivated by material rewards.	1	3	1	1		1		2	2	3	2	16	6.6
Display above average intelligence in class.	1	1	1	1		3	4	1	3		1	16	6.4
Consider fashion and dress important.	1	1	2	1	3	2		1	4	1		16	5.9
From middle to upper socioeconomic class.			2	1	3	7	1		2			16	5.8
Considered a school leader.	1	1	4		1	2	2		5			16	5.7
Easily influenced by peers.	1		3	1	2	2	3	3	1			16	5.6
Difficulty with abstract concepts.	1		3	5	1	1	1		4			16	5.3
College educated parents.	1		4	2	1	3	2	1	2			16	5.3
Lower third of his/her class academically.	1	3	2	2	2	3	1	1	1			16	4.6
Low status by other students.	1	4	1	3	2		3	1		1		16	4.6
Doesn't perform well in basic academic skills.	1	1	3	4	5	1	1					16	4.1
Need remedial help in high school.	1	3	2	6	2			1	1			16	4.0
Frequently absent.	1	6	2	3		1		1	1	1		16	4.0
Difficult to motivate.	1	2	5	1	4	2	1					16	3.9
Generally bored with school.	1	4	5	2	1			2	1			16	3.9
Disciplinary problems.		8	5	3								16	2.7

\*Indicates number of Respondents or Responses.

Administrators were also given the opportunity to provide any additional descriptors about PTE magnet program students within the Meridian School District. The following were the statements included in the responses to the survey:

1. Attendance and maintaining an interest with PTE magnet program students was a challenge.
2. PTE magnet program students know how to drop themselves when the program won't do it for them.
3. I had found the students in the magnet programs to be very socially responsible.
4. PTE magnet program students had always been very polite and had used manners.

### **Summary**

Based on the survey results administrators' generally agree PTE magnet programs are fitting for the population of student served by MSD. Although, most administrators do see the usefulness of PTE magnet programs there is some disagreement about which path PTE magnet program students will choose in their future career. Administrators' generally view PTE magnet program students as self-confident and highly motivated. This theme carries through to administrators' views of PTE magnet program instructors, agreeing most PTE magnet program instructors are highly qualified and trained in their field.

## **Chapter V**

### **RESULTS, CONCLUSIONS, OBSERVATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

#### **Population Demographics**

The PTE magnet programs being studied had been implemented beginning as early as 2002, growing to encompass a total of 12 separate PTE program areas with 20 PTE magnet instructors, and 3,377 non-duplicated magnet program students in 2013. Additionally, the researcher targeted administrators within Joint School District #2 who had direct duties related to PTE magnet programs, instructors, and students. Of all of the administrators within MSD, 38 were selected to participate in the survey. The researcher adapted a series of research questions to ascertain Meridian School District administrators' perceptions of PTE magnet programs, instructors, and students. An administrator from each secondary school in the district was selected; the superintendent, the assistant superintendent, area directors, and PTE district administrative staff were also invited to participate in the survey for a total population of 38. Of the 38 invitees, 19 responded (50%) to the survey questions and one opted out of the survey, 12 (63%) of the responders were male, seven (37%) were female. Of the respondents, 14 (74%) were building level administrators and five (26%) were district office administrators. The survey was conducted beginning in November of 2013 and concluded January of 2014. Each of the questions was analyzed using quantitative and some qualitative analyses where appropriate.



## Results & Conclusions Based on the Study

### **Research Question #1: Administrators' perspectives of PTE magnet programs.**

The researcher identified five hypotheses related to magnet programs within Joint School District #2. The following three hypotheses were related to administrator perspectives of PTE magnet programs:

1. Administrators perceive no value for PTE programs within the school and district.

Based on the survey results, this hypothesis was rejected. The survey results indicated while 100% ( $n=15$ ) of administrators believed PTE programs were, in fact, expensive to maintain ( $\bar{X} = 9.9$ ), 80% ( $n=12$ ) also believed PTE magnet programs were beneficial for the education of the whole person ( $\bar{X} = 8.5$ ). Additionally, 80% ( $n=12$ ) of administrators indicated they believed magnet programs were not outdated, and stated this condition was descriptive of less than 20% of PTE magnet programs ( $\bar{X} = 2.5$ ). These responses indicate administrators believe while PTE programs may be of great expense to the school system, they were also vital in educating the whole student, showing administrators perceive PTE magnet programs to have true value.

2. Administrators perceive no viable role of magnet programs within the school and district.

This hypothesis was rejected because administrators indicated they believed PTE magnet students were college bound and specifically, 60% ( $n=9$ ) of administrators believed at least 61% or more PTE students were college bound ( $\bar{X} = 6.9$ ), thereby imputing PTE magnet programs did help to prepare students for career and college readiness.

Additionally, 79% ( $n=11$ ) of administrators'' agreed PTE magnet programs have a strong association with Idaho's achievement standards ( $\bar{X} = 8.3$ ). Showing PTE magnet

programs do serve a viable role in preparing students to achieve high academic standards and career readiness.

3. Administrators perceive no differences between magnet and traditional secondary school PTE programs.

Of the administrators surveyed, 80% ( $n=12$ ) indicated they believed that 20% or less of PTE magnet programs focused on occupations that were not in demand ( $\bar{X} = 2.9$ ). The administrators did believe PTE magnet programs were viable and added value to the traditional schooling system; therefore the researcher rejected this hypothesis.

**Research Question #2: Administrator perspectives of PTE magnet program instructors.**

The following hypothesis was related to administrators' perspectives of PTE magnet instructors:

4. Administrators perceive PTE instructors to be a lower quality instructor in comparison to a general education instructor.

This hypothesis was rejected. The survey results indicated the administrators believed PTE magnet instructors to be similarly prepared as general education instructors. When administrators were asked their perception of PTE magnet instructors' education and training, 94% ( $n=15$ ) of administrators responded with the perception that 81% or more of the PTE magnet instructors possessed a baccalaureate degree ( $\bar{X} = 10.4$ ). Additionally, 88% ( $n=14$ ) of administrators surveyed also believed 51% or more PTE magnet instructors had a lot of on-the-job experience ( $\bar{X} = 9.5$ ). All 16 (100%) of the administrators who responded stated they believed 41% or more instructors within the PTE magnet programs had formal training in pedagogy ( $\bar{X} = 9.8$ ).

**Research Question #3: Administrators' perspectives of PTE magnet program students.**

The following hypothesis was related to administrators' perspectives of PTE magnet program students:

5. Administrators perceive PTE students to be of lower quality in comparison to other non-PTE students within the district.

This hypothesis was rejected. Results showed a majority ( $n=10$ , 63%) of administrators believed PTE magnet students had intentions of attending a four-year college or university ( $\bar{X} = 6.9$ ). Administrators ( $n=11$ , 69%) indicated that less than 40% of PTE magnet students were low status within the school ( $\bar{X} = 4.6$ ). Additionally, PTE magnet program students were perceived to exemplify what his/her school stood for by 69% ( $n=11$ ) of administrators indicating 61% of PTE magnet students exemplified what his/her school stands for ( $\bar{X} = 7.1$ ). Administrators were also asked six questions about their perceptions of PTE magnet program students' goals in life. Administrators ( $n=9$ , 60%) indicated they believed 51% or more of PTE magnet program students knew what they wanted from life ( $\bar{X} = 7.0$ ).

**Observations Based on the Study**

These observations were not listed by priority. The list of observations was as follows:

1. Administrators perceived PTE magnet programs to be impactful in their school.
2. Administrators perceived PTE magnet program instructors to be well-trained, educated, and knowledgeable instructors who were passionate about PTE and the school community.

3. Administrators perceived PTE magnet program students to be intelligent, fun and goal-oriented.
4. Administrators believed PTE to be modern and useful in the education of the whole person.
5. Administrators believe PTE magnet programs to be useful and beneficial to the overall success of the student.
6. Based on the research questions, purpose of the study and the statement of the problem of this study it is recommended where appropriate for school districts to utilize state funded PTE magnet programs.

### **Recommendations for Future Study**

The following recommendations were presented as primary recommendations for future study based on data collected within the study:

1. This study, in its current form, should be replicated in other magnet schools throughout the state of Idaho, as well as other states containing PTE magnet programs.
2. This study, in its current form, should be replicated to determine secondary counselors' perspectives of PTE magnet programs, instructors, and students within Joint School District #2, as well as Idaho, and the United States.
3. This study, in its current form, should be replicated to determine parents' perspectives of PTE magnet programs, instructors, and students within Joint School District #2, as well as Idaho, and the United States.

4. Additional study should focus on the general public's perspectives of PTE magnet program, instructors, and students in addition to and in contrast to the traditional PTE program emphasizing efficiency and effectiveness.
5. Additional study should focus on the effect of increased class sizes in PTE magnet programs.

## References

- Álvarez, B., Graham, E., & Walker, T. (2014). Three Schools Give New, Positive Meaning to 'School Choice'. *NEA Today*, 4.
- Archbald, D.A., (1999). Principals' perceptions of management control: Actual and desired. *Educational Research Quarterly*, 22(3).
- Bifulco, R., Cobb, C.D., Bell, C., (2009). Can Interdistrict Choice Boost Student Achievement? The Case of Connecticut's Interdistrict Magnet School Program. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 323-345.
- Cannon, J. G., Kitchel, A., & Duncan, D. W. (2012). Perceived teaching and learning professional development needs of Idaho secondary career and technical education teachers. *The Researcher* 24(1).
- Cannon, J. G., Kitchel, A., & Duncan, D. W. (2010). Identifying perceived professional development needs of Idaho secondary CTE teachers: Program management needs of skilled and technical science teachers. *Journal of Industrial Teacher Education* 47(1), 43-70.
- Cannon, J. G., Kitchel, A., Tenuto, P. L., & Joki, R. A. (2012). *School administrators' perceptions of secondary CTE teachers' teaching and learning professional development needs*. Paper presented at the CTE Research and Professional Development Conference, Atlanta, GA.
- Charles, C.M. (1998). *Introduction to educational research, third edition*. Reading, MA: Addison Wesley Longman, Inc.
- Creswell, J. (2013). *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing Among Five Approaches*. Sage Publications.

- Exline, E. (2014). *Joint school district number 2*. Retrieved from [www.meridianschools.org](http://www.meridianschools.org).
- Fleming, N. (2012). Magnets adjust to new climate of school choice. *Education Week*, p. 16.
- Gelber, S., (2008). "The crux and the magic": The political history of Boston magnet schools, 1968–1989. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 41(4), 453-466.
- Gordon, H. R. (2008). *The history and growth of career and technical education in America* (3rd ed.). Long Grove, Ill.: Waveland Press.
- Hausman, C.S., Goldring, E.B., (2000). Parent involvement, influence, and satisfaction in magnet schools: Did reasons for choice matter?, 32(2), 1-105.
- Hausman, C.S., Goldring, E.B., (2000). School community in different magnet program structures, 11(1), 80-102.
- Haynes, K.T., (2010). Latino parents' choice of magnet school: how school choice differs across racial and ethnic boundaries. *Journal of Education & Urban Society*, 42(6), 1-758.
- Idaho division of professional-technical education annual report*. (2013). Boise, ID: Idaho Division of Professional-Technical Education.
- "Idaho State Department of Education." - *School Finance Data and Stats*. N.p., n.d. Web. 14 Apr. 2014. <<https://www.sde.idaho.gov/site/statistics/>
- Jackson, N. (2014). Joining Hands: CTE Programs Partner With Employers for Success. *Techniques: Connecting Education & Careers*, 89(1), 16.
- Kidwai, S. (2011). Changing the image of cte. *Techniques: Connecting Education & Careers*, 86(4), 16-19.
- Leeds, B. (2014). *Joint school district no. 2*. Retrieved from [www.meridianschools.org](http://www.meridianschools.org).

- Leedy, P. D., & Ormrod, J. E. (2010). *Practical research, planning and design*. Prentice Hall.
- Lindner, J.R., Murphy, T.H., & Briers, G.E. (2001). Handling nonresponse in social science research. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 42(4), 43-53.
- Low, S. (2012). *Joint school district no. 2*. Retrieved from [www.meridianschools.org](http://www.meridianschools.org).
- Mason, K. (2012). *Association for career and technical education*. Retrieved from <https://www.acteonline.org/about.aspx>.
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2001). NCES Statistical Analysis Report. Available at <[www.nces.ed.gov/pubs2001/overview](http://www.nces.ed.gov/pubs2001/overview)>.
- Newcomer S., Seaton M. (2007). Choices: BEYOND THE DIPLOMA: Career technical education. *Leadership*, 37(1), 30.
- Park, T., Pearson, D., & Sawyer, J. (2011). Changing approaches-changing perspectives. *Techniques: Connecting Education & Careers*, 86(4), 20-23.
- Riesenberg, L. E., & Lierman, S. R. (1990). Perceptions of Administrators and Instructors Concerning Factors Influencing Secondary Agriculture Enrollment. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 31, 7-11. Retrieved August 1, 2014, from <http://www.jae-online.org>
- Schwarz, T. (2012). *Idaho professional-technical education*. Retrieved from [http://www.pte.idaho.gov/About\\_Us.html](http://www.pte.idaho.gov/About_Us.html).
- Shober, A.F., (2011). Attracting capital: Magnets, charters, and school referendum success. *Journal of School Choice*, 5(2), 1-205.
- Vail, K. (2007). Technology drives career & technical education in secondary school reform. *Education Digest*, 72(8), 4-11.



**APPENDIX A**  
**INSTRUMENT**

Welcome!
Participant Consent Form
The University of Idaho Institutional Review Board has approved this project.
The topic of this study is to determine administrator's perspectives of PTE (Professional Technical Education) Magnet Programs, Instructors and Students specifically within the Meridian School District.
You will be asked to answer the following survey questions. The study should take approximately 15-20 minutes.
You will benefit from this project by helping us understand the true perceived effectiveness of PTE Magnet Programs, Instructors and Students within the Meridian School District. Society will benefit because it will help us implement thoughtful and meaningful PTE Magnet programs within Idaho and the Meridian School District.
All information you provide will always be password protected and ONLY accessed by myself and my faculty sponsor. (Dr. Allison Touchstone)
If you have any questions about the study, survey or interview, you can ask the investigator during the interview, when the survey and/or interview is complete, or at a time you feel is appropriate.
Investigator:
William T. Schumaker
University of Idaho
Dept. of Ag. Ed. & 4H Youth Dev. Moscow, ID 83844-0000
Ph. 208-885-6358
Faculty Sponsor: Allison J.L. Touchstone
University of Idaho
Dept. of Ag. Ed. & 4H Youth Dev. Moscow, ID 83844-1234
Ph. 208-885-6358
During the course of this study, you may stop at any time with no penalty.
If you do stop your participation in the study, there will be no penalties associated with your withdrawal. Thank you!
*1. This research study presents no more than minimal risk of harm to subjects and involves no procedures for which written consent is normally required outside of the research context.
Do you agree to waive your right to documentation of consent and continue with the survey?
Yes No
Demographics
*2. Do students from the building you administer attend a PTE magnet facility within the Meridian School District?
Yes No
*3. Do you currently directly supervise any Instructors that teach at a PTE magnet school?
Yes No
*4. Please identify the program areas in which your magnet program Instructors are teaching. Please mark all appropriate responses.
Ag. & Natural Resources
Business Management & Marketing
Engineering Technology Education
Family & Consumer Sciences
Health Professions
Individualized Occupational Training
Skilled & Technical Sciences
None of the Above
<b>Administrator Perceptions of PTE Magnet Program Students</b>

Please indicate the probability that these statements represent a student that would attend a PTE magnet program in the Meridian School District.										
5. Students in PTE Magnet Programs have disciplinary problems.	1-10%	11-20%	21-30%	31-40%	41-50%	51-60%	61-70%	71-80%	81-90%	91-100%
6. Students in PTE Magnet Programs exemplify what his or her school stands for.	1-10%	11-20%	21-30%	31-40%	41-50%	51-60%	61-70%	71-80%	81-90%	91-100%
7. Students in PTE Magnet Programs display above average intelligence in class.	1-10%	11-20%	21-30%	31-40%	41-50%	51-60%	61-70%	71-80%	81-90%	91-100%
8. Students in PTE Magnet Programs are motivated by material rewards.	1-10%	11-20%	21-30%	31-40%	41-50%	51-60%	61-70%	71-80%	81-90%	91-100%
9. Students in PTE Magnet Programs are fun to be around.	1-10%	11-20%	21-30%	31-40%	41-50%	51-60%	61-70%	71-80%	81-90%	91-100%
10. Students in PTE Magnet Programs are good with concrete concepts.	1-10%	11-20%	21-30%	31-40%	41-50%	51-60%	61-70%	71-80%	81-90%	91-100%
11. Students in PTE Magnet Programs know what he/she wants from life.	1-10%	11-20%	21-30%	31-40%	41-50%	51-60%	61-70%	71-80%	81-90%	91-100%
12. Students in PTE Magnet Programs have difficulty with abstract concepts.	1-10%	11-20%	21-30%	31-40%	41-50%	51-60%	61-70%	71-80%	81-90%	91-100%
13. Students in PTE Magnet Programs are well liked by his/her classmates.	1-10%	11-20%	21-30%	31-40%	41-50%	51-60%	61-70%	71-80%	81-90%	91-100%
14. Students in PTE Magnet Programs have plans to attend a four year college.	1-10%	11-20%	21-30%	31-40%	41-50%	51-60%	61-70%	71-80%	81-90%	91-100%

15. Students in PTE Magnet Programs are generally bored with school.	1-10%	11-20%	21-30%	31-40%	41-50%	51-60%	61-70%	71-80%	81-90%	91-100%
16. Students in PTE Magnet Programs are considered a school leader.	1-10%	11-20%	21-30%	31-40%	41-50%	51-60%	61-70%	71-80%	81-90%	91-100%
17. Students in PTE Magnet Programs show respect for all teachers.	1-10%	11-20%	21-30%	31-40%	41-50%	51-60%	61-70%	71-80%	81-90%	91-100%
18. Students in PTE Magnet Programs would be rated in the lower third of his/her class academically.	1-10%	11-20%	21-30%	31-40%	41-50%	51-60%	61-70%	71-80%	81-90%	91-100%
19. Students in PTE Magnet Programs are sure about his/her future career choice.	1-10%	11-20%	21-30%	31-40%	41-50%	51-60%	61-70%	71-80%	81-90%	91-100%
20. Students in PTE Magnet Programs do not perform well in basic academic skill areas.	1-10%	11-20%	21-30%	31-40%	41-50%	51-60%	61-70%	71-80%	81-90%	91-100%
21. Students in PTE Magnet Programs generally enjoy nonacademic classes more than academic classes.	1-10%	11-20%	21-30%	31-40%	41-50%	51-60%	61-70%	71-80%	81-90%	91-100%
22. Students in PTE Magnet Programs have college educated parents.	1-10%	11-20%	21-30%	31-40%	41-50%	51-60%	61-70%	71-80%	81-90%	91-100%
23. Students in PTE Magnet Programs are interested in life.	1-10%	11-20%	21-30%	31-40%	41-50%	51-60%	61-70%	71-80%	81-90%	91-100%
24. Students in PTE Magnet Programs are self confident.	1-10%	11-20%	21-30%	31-40%	41-50%	51-60%	61-70%	71-80%	81-90%	91-100%
25. Students in PTE Magnet Programs are difficult to motivate.	1-10%	11-20%	21-30%	31-40%	41-50%	51-60%	61-70%	71-80%	81-90%	91-100%

26. Students in PTE Magnet Programs consider grades important.	1-10%	11-20%	21-30%	31-40%	41-50%	51-60%	61-70%	71-80%	81-90%	91-100%
27. Students in PTE Magnet Programs feel his/her high school career is important.	1-10%	11-20%	21-30%	31-40%	41-50%	51-60%	61-70%	71-80%	81-90%	91-100%
28. Students in PTE Magnet Programs are motivated in school by a sense of accomplishment.	1-10%	11-20%	21-30%	31-40%	41-50%	51-60%	61-70%	71-80%	81-90%	91-100%
29. Students in PTE Magnet Programs are interested in the social aspects of school.	1-10%	11-20%	21-30%	31-40%	41-50%	51-60%	61-70%	71-80%	81-90%	91-100%
30. Students in PTE Magnet Programs are interested in how others feel about him/her.	1-10%	11-20%	21-30%	31-40%	41-50%	51-60%	61-70%	71-80%	81-90%	91-100%
31. Students in PTE Magnet Programs will need remedial help in high school.	1-10%	11-20%	21-30%	31-40%	41-50%	51-60%	61-70%	71-80%	81-90%	91-100%
32. Students in PTE Magnet Programs would be perceived as having a low status by other students.	1-10%	11-20%	21-30%	31-40%	41-50%	51-60%	61-70%	71-80%	81-90%	91-100%
33. Students in PTE Magnet Programs are frequently absent.	1-10%	11-20%	21-30%	31-40%	41-50%	51-60%	61-70%	71-80%	81-90%	91-100%
34. Students in PTE Magnet Programs see high school as a means of achieving life's goals.	1-10%	11-20%	21-30%	31-40%	41-50%	51-60%	61-70%	71-80%	81-90%	91-100%
35. Students in PTE Magnet Programs are from middle to upper socioeconomic class.	1-10%	11-20%	21-30%	31-40%	41-50%	51-60%	61-70%	71-80%	81-90%	91-100%

36. Students in PTE Magnet Programs consider fashion and dress important.	1-10%	11-20%	21-30%	31-40%	41-50%	51-60%	61-70%	71-80%	81-90%	91-100%
37. Students in PTE Magnet Programs are easily influenced by peers.	1-10%	11-20%	21-30%	31-40%	41-50%	51-60%	61-70%	71-80%	81-90%	91-100%
38. Do you have any additional descriptors of students in the Meridian School District who attend PTE Magnet Programs? Please provide any additional information below:										
<b>Administrator Perceptions of PTE Magnet Program Instructors</b>										
<b>Please indicate the probability that each of these statements accurately describes a typical instructor that would teach within a PTE magnet program within the Meridian School District.</b>										
39. Instructors in PTE Magnet Programs possess a bachelor's degree.	1-10%	11-20%	21-30%	31-40%	41-50%	51-60%	61-70%	71-80%	81-90%	91-100%
40. Instructors in PTE Magnet Programs have formal training in pedagogy (instruction).	1-10%	11-20%	21-30%	31-40%	41-50%	51-60%	61-70%	71-80%	81-90%	91-100%
41. Instructors in PTE Magnet Programs have a lot of onthejob experience.	1-10%	11-20%	21-30%	31-40%	41-50%	51-60%	61-70%	71-80%	81-90%	91-100%
42. Instructors in PTE Magnet Programs are more of practitioners than theorists.	1-10%	11-20%	21-30%	31-40%	41-50%	51-60%	61-70%	71-80%	81-90%	91-100%
43. Instructors in PTE Magnet Programs are not involved in the school's extracurricular activities.	1-10%	11-20%	21-30%	31-40%	41-50%	51-60%	61-70%	71-80%	81-90%	91-100%
44. Instructors in PTE Magnet Programs are interested in the social aspects of school.	1-10%	11-20%	21-30%	31-40%	41-50%	51-60%	61-70%	71-80%	81-90%	91-100%
45. Instructors in PTE Magnet Programs exemplify what his/her school stands for.	1-10%	11-20%	21-30%	31-40%	41-50%	51-60%	61-70%	71-80%	81-90%	91-100%

46. Instructors in PTE Magnet Programs are good with concrete concepts.	1-10%	11-20%	21-30%	31-40%	41-50%	51-60%	61-70%	71-80%	81-90%	91-100%
47. Instructors in PTE Magnet Programs are leaders in the school.	1-10%	11-20%	21-30%	31-40%	41-50%	51-60%	61-70%	71-80%	81-90%	91-100%
48. Instructors in PTE Magnet Programs possess a master's degree.	1-10%	11-20%	21-30%	31-40%	41-50%	51-60%	61-70%	71-80%	81-90%	91-100%
49. Instructors in PTE Magnet Programs would be perceived as having a lower status by other teachers.	1-10%	11-20%	21-30%	31-40%	41-50%	51-60%	61-70%	71-80%	81-90%	91-100%
50. Instructors in PTE Magnet Programs are above average in intelligence.	1-10%	11-20%	21-30%	31-40%	41-50%	51-60%	61-70%	71-80%	81-90%	91-100%
51. Do you have any additional descriptors of teachers in the Meridian School District who currently teach in PTE Magnet Programs? Please provide any additional information below:										
<b>Administrator Perceptions of PTE Magnet Programs</b>										
<b>Please indicate the probability that each of these statements accurately describes a typical secondary PTE magnet program in the Meridian School District.</b>										
52. All students can benefit from PTE magnet programs.	1-10%	11-20%	21-30%	31-40%	41-50%	51-60%	61-70%	71-80%	81-90%	91-100%
53. PTE Magnet Programs are better suited for students who work well with their hands.	1-10%	11-20%	21-30%	31-40%	41-50%	51-60%	61-70%	71-80%	81-90%	91-100%
54. PTE Magnet Programs are for students who have above average intelligence.	1-10%	11-20%	21-30%	31-40%	41-50%	51-60%	61-70%	71-80%	81-90%	91-100%
55. PTE Magnet Programs are for students who do not perform well in the basic skill areas.	1-10%	11-20%	21-30%	31-40%	41-50%	51-60%	61-70%	71-80%	81-90%	91-100%
56. PTE Magnet Programs are expensive to maintain.	1-10%	11-20%	21-30%	31-40%	41-50%	51-60%	61-70%	71-80%	81-90%	91-100%

57. PTE Magnet Program enrollment is typically comprised of students with a bluecollar or agricultural background.	1-10%	11-20%	21-30%	31-40%	41-50%	51-60%	61-70%	71-80%	81-90%	91-100%
58. PTE Magnet Programs are for students who plan to enter high skill/high wage occupations.	1-10%	11-20%	21-30%	31-40%	41-50%	51-60%	61-70%	71-80%	81-90%	91-100%
59. PTE Magnet Programs are isolated from the rest of the school.	1-10%	11-20%	21-30%	31-40%	41-50%	51-60%	61-70%	71-80%	81-90%	91-100%
60. Provides for the education of the whole person.	1-10%	11-20%	21-30%	31-40%	41-50%	51-60%	61-70%	71-80%	81-90%	91-100%
61. PTE Magnet Programs are for college bound students.	1-10%	11-20%	21-30%	31-40%	41-50%	51-60%	61-70%	71-80%	81-90%	91-100%
62. PTE Magnet Programs are outdated.	1-10%	11-20%	21-30%	31-40%	41-50%	51-60%	61-70%	71-80%	81-90%	91-100%
63. PTE Magnet Programs have a strong association with Idaho's learning achievement standards.	1-10%	11-20%	21-30%	31-40%	41-50%	51-60%	61-70%	71-80%	81-90%	91-100%
64. PTE Magnet Programs are remedial in nature.	1-10%	11-20%	21-30%	31-40%	41-50%	51-60%	61-70%	71-80%	81-90%	91-100%
65. PTE Magnet Programs are focused on occupations that aren't in demand.	1-10%	11-20%	21-30%	31-40%	41-50%	51-60%	61-70%	71-80%	81-90%	91-100%
66. PTE Magnet Programs do a good job of preparing people for meaningful employment.	1-10%	11-20%	21-30%	31-40%	41-50%	51-60%	61-70%	71-80%	81-90%	91-100%
67. PTE Magnet Programs provide a seamless transition to employment.	1-10%	11-20%	21-30%	31-40%	41-50%	51-60%	61-70%	71-80%	81-90%	91-100%



68. PTE Magnet Programs are a good return on investment.	1-10%	11-20%	21-30%	31-40%	41-50%	51-60%	61-70%	71-80%	81-90%	91-100%
69. Do you have any additional descriptors of PTE magnet programs in the Meridian School District? Please provide any additional information below:										
-----										
THANK YOU!!										
Thank you for your participation in this study. Your time and input are valuable to us.										

**APPENDIX B**

**PARTICIPANT INVITATION LETTERS AND PERMISSION FORMS**

**Invitational E-mail**

November 5, 2013

Mr./Ms. [Last Name],

As a Joint School District #2 Administrator in Meridian, Idaho you are being invited to participate in my thesis study on Administrator's Perspectives of PTE (Professional-Technical Education) Magnet Programs, Instructors and students in the Meridian School District. I am excited to gather your perceptions of PTE Magnet programs in the Meridian School District.

In the next week, you will be receiving another e-mail from me with the website address, consent and instructions for the online survey. The survey will take you approximately 15-20 minutes to complete.

Thank you once again for your consideration to participate in this study. I hope the study will provide valuable information about PTE Magnet Programs in the Meridian School District.

Sincerely,

Will T. Schumaker  
Investigator  
Agricultural Science & Technology Instructor  
Meridian Professional-Technical Center  
1900 W. Pine Ave.  
Meridian, ID 83642  
(208) 350-4160

Allison J.L. Touchstone  
Faculty Sponsor  
University of Idaho  
Dept. of Ag. Ed. & 4-H Youth Dev.  
Moscow, ID 83844-1234  
Ph. 208-885-6358

## Survey E-mail Instructions

November 12, 2013

Mr./Ms. [Last Name],

The PTE Magnet Programs Perspectives survey is now available on line. The survey can be found at the web address below.

Please click on the link below or copy the link and paste it in the address line in your browser to complete the survey:

**<http://www.surveymonkey.com/s.aspx>**

This link is uniquely tied to this survey and your email address. Please did not forward this message. The survey should take you approximately 15-20 minutes to complete.

Please be complete and honest in your responses. Some of the questions require an answer before you can continue with the survey, and some of the questions had several responses.

During the course of this study, you may stop at any time with no penalty. If you did stop your participation in the study, there will be no penalties associated with your withdrawal.

Thank you once again for your willingness to participate in this study.

Sincerely,

Will T. Schumaker  
Investigator  
Agricultural Science & Technology Instructor  
Meridian Professional-Technical Center  
1900 W. Pine Ave.  
Meridian, ID 83642  
(208) 350-4160

Allison J.L. Touchstone  
Faculty Sponsor  
University of Idaho  
Dept. of Ag. Ed. & 4-H Youth Dev.  
Moscow, ID 83844-1234  
Ph. 208-885-6358

**APPENDIX C**

**PARTICIPANT NOTIFICATION E-MAIL AND FOLLOW UP E-MAILS**

### Participant Notification E-mail

Reminder: Please Take My Survey

Dear [CustomData] [LastName],

As a Joint School District #2 Administrator in Meridian, Idaho you are being invited to participate in my thesis study on Administrator's Perspectives of PTE (Professional-Technical Education) Magnet Programs, Instructors and students in the Meridian School District. I am excited to gather your perceptions of PTE Magnet programs in the Meridian School District.

Here is a link to the survey:

[SurveyLink]

This link is uniquely tied to this survey and your email address. Please did not forward this message.

Thanks for your participation!

Will T. Schumaker  
Investigator  
Agricultural Science & Technology Instructor  
Meridian Professional-Technical Center  
1900 W. Pine Ave.  
Meridian, ID 83642  
(208) 350-4160

Allison J.L. Touchstone  
Faculty Sponsor  
University of Idaho  
Dept. of Ag. Ed. & 4-H Youth Dev.  
Moscow, ID 83844-1234  
Ph. 208-885-6358

Please note: If you did not wish to receive further emails from us, please click the link below, and you will be automatically removed from our mailing list.

[RemoveLink]

**APPENDIX D**

**INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD SUBMISSION & APPROVAL**

## **Institutional Review Board Application**

### Form 2: Non-Exempt Application Materials

University of Idaho procedures require that the Institutional Review Board (IRB) review and approve of projects involving humans. Official approval from the IRB must be given **before** the research can begin.

Forms should be emailed as attachments to [irb@uidaho.edu](mailto:irb@uidaho.edu) in **Microsoft Word format**.

If you are a student, you should be listed as the student investigator and your faculty sponsor as the PI. You must submit your materials to your UI faculty sponsor/PI. After their review and approval, they will FORWARD your materials to the IRB for review.

If you are not a full-time faculty member or employee at the UI, you must contact a departmental faculty member, administrator or department chair. This person will become your faculty sponsor.

Once you had submitted the completed application, the Institutional Review Board will approve it. **You can begin the research ONLY AFTER receiving WRITTEN approval from the committee.**

Please allow at least **six weeks excluding holidays** for the initial review and approval process. [Note: The approval process takes longer when corrections are requested by committee members or when we had a large number of applications].

**Note:** All researchers participating in human subject's research are required to take the online course through the National Institutes of Health  
<http://phrp.nihtraining.com/users/login.php>

**Copies of certificates of completion will be required before projects will be approved.**



Please include your UI campus mail code address (83844 - 2040) on the summary form inside, and an **address** below.

Mr. Will Schumaker

---

c/o Dr. Allison Touchstone, Ag Education

---

322 E Front Street, Suite 440

---

Boise, Idaho 83702

---

**Investigator e-mail:** wschumaker@vandals.uidaho.edu

**Faculty Sponsor e-mail if applicable** atouchstone@uidaho.edu

**Form 2: University of Idaho Human Subject Review – Non-exempt Projects**

This project qualifies for “Non-Exempt” status. Please complete the following application. In addition, the following information must be included:

1. An electronic copy of certification in PDF or Microsoft Word format that the online course sponsored by the National Institutes of Health has been completed by everyone listed on the project.  
NIH website: <http://phrp.nihtraining.com/users/login.php>
2. If applicable, an electronic copy of an Informed Consent Form that includes all components provided at: <http://www.uidaho.edu/ora/committees/irb/irbforms>
3. If applicable, a copy of the survey, questions intended to be asked, or if conducting qualitative research, initial entry questions and items where the investigator might probe for additional information.

Principal Investigator: Allison Touchstone Academic Title: Senior Instructor

Student Investigator: William T. Schumaker

Department: Ag. Ed. & 4-H Youth Development Campus Zip Code: 83844

Phone: 208-885-6358

Project Title:

Administrator's Perspectives of Meridian School District PTE Magnet Programs, Instructors and Students

Proposal Number: \_\_\_\_\_

Previous IRB protocol Number: \_\_\_\_\_

Anticipated Start Date: November 1, 2013

Anticipated End Date: May 15, 2013

Faculty Sponsor (if you are not principal investigator) Dr. Allison J. L. Touchstone

Is the project seeking funds? (Answer using a bold "X") YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO **X**

## I. SUBJECTS/PARTICIPANTS

A. Approximate number 20

B. Age Range 28-65

C. How will participants be selected or recruited?

**Participants will be building level principals and vice principals as well as district level PTE administrators within Joint School District No. 2 located in Meridian, ID.**

D. Are there participants who will be excluded? Why?

**Yes, administrators not within Meridian School District (Specifically because the study is focused on the Meridian School District in Meridian, Idaho). Additionally, participants may opt out of the study.**

**Yes, the study will be delimited to high school administrators, not elementary and middle school because there currently are no magnet facilities within the elementary and middle schools.**

E. Will participants be paid? **NO**

F. Are any of the participants not competent to give consent (e.g., minors, prisoners, institutionalized)? **NO**

Are there procedures for gaining assent (if appropriate)? **NO**

G. Will this study be conducted in an Educational (School / Pre K - 12) setting and involve children or teachers actively teaching within the classroom as part of the study?

**No teachers or students will be utilized in this study, only administrators within the school district, specifically focusing on secondary (grades 9-12) administrators working within Professional-Technical Education Magnet Programs.**

## II. DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT:

A. Describe the Purpose of the Research:

**Magnet schools throughout the state of Idaho were a new concept having been studied extensively through the United States yet, specifically within Idaho their effectiveness had not been studied. Specifically, within the Meridian School District, magnet schools were a new concept that had been implemented, but their true effectiveness had not been studied and analyzed. The purpose of this study was to truly assess if PTE magnet programs, specifically, are worth the investment in capital, time, teachers and most importantly if students are successful, while also considering the core issue of whether administrators perceive magnet programs to be a valuable asset within a school district.**

B. Describe the Research Design:

**Online surveys will be utilized. This study will be a quantitative case study.**

**Based on the answers to these survey questions individual respondents will be interviewed and will be asked to expand on questions specific to the survey.**

C. Describe the Procedures (What will the Participants did).

**All participants will complete an online survey and submit responses online to the investigator. The online survey is attached.**

D. If any deception (withholding of complete information) is required for the validity of this activity, explain why this is necessary and **attach** a debriefing statement. **N/A**

## III. ASSESSMENT OF RISKS AND BENEFITS.

A. Describe the nature of any potential risks. These include stress, social, legal, discomfort, invasion of privacy, embarrassment, or side effects.

**Minimal risks associated with the study. Although, minimal the participant may find the study to be time consuming, or tedious.**

B. Describe how each of the risks in part A will be minimized. Be detailed and complete.

**Participants will be reminded if they feel the study to be too time consuming or tedious and if they wish to terminate participation in the study at any point in time they can exit the electronic survey without any negative consequences.**

- C. In the event that any of these potential risks occur, how will they be handled (e.g., compensation, counseling, etc.)?

**The risks are minimal in nature although if the participant did feel they had been harmed by the study, appropriate actions will be taken which could be compensation for time.**

- D. Will this study interfere with any subject's normal routine (e.g., school attendance, medical treatment, etc.)?

**No interference anticipated.**

- E. Describe the expected benefits to society and to the individual subjects.

**The information gathered from this study will benefit society by providing school districts specifically within Idaho and even throughout the United States with data about how administrators perceive magnet programs within the Meridian School District. The Meridian School District will be able to utilize the data to analyze the effectiveness and perceived effectiveness of magnet programs within the district. This data can be useful when making decisions about future implementation of magnet programs within the district.**

**The information gathered from this study will benefit the individual subjects by allowing the individual administrators within the district to use the study to make future decisions that effect magnet programs within the Meridian School District. This data again can be useful when making decisions about the future implementation of magnet programs within the district.**

- F. Will blood be taken? (Answer using a Bold "X")      YES\_\_\_\_ NO\_\_**X**\_

#### **IV. CONFIDENTIALITY OF DATA**

- A. Will data be anonymous (i.e., even the researcher will not be able to link the identity of the subjects/participants with responses)?

YES \_\_\_\_\_ (Go to Part C)

NO **\_X**\_\_\_\_\_ (If NO, complete item IV-B.)

- B. Will data be confidential?      YES\_\_\_\_ NO\_\_**X**\_\_\_\_

If **YES**,

Will the data be coded to a master list?      YES\_\_\_\_ NO\_\_\_\_

Will the list be kept separate from the data? YES\_\_\_\_ NO\_\_\_\_

If **NO**,

Who else will had access to the data? **Researcher and faculty advisor**  
Why? **For analysis purposes**

How will confidentiality be maximized?

**Data will be stored on a password protected survey monkey account  
accessed only be the investigator and faculty sponsor.**

C. How will the data be stored? Restricted/Password protected Computer   **X**  

D. How will the data eventually be deleted? If not deleted, how will linkage to identities be broken?

**After completion of the study, data will be deleted and not linked to the participants.**

#### V. ADDITIONAL IMPORTANT CONSIDERATIONS

A. Will any investigational NEW drug (IND) be used? YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO   **X**  

B. Will any other drugs be used? YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO   **X**  

C. Will a new investigative device (IDE) be used? YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO   **X**  

D. Will ethyl alcohol be ingested by the participants? YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO   **X**  

E. Will audio-visual tapes, audiotapes or photographs be taken? YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO   **X**  

F. Will a written consent form be obtained? YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO   **X**  

If **YES**: please attach consent form **Survey and Consent Attached**

If **NO**: how will consent be obtained? **Participants will be allowed to opt out their right to a written consent form. If they did not agree the survey will be terminated immediately.**

Why is this method being used?

**To ensure participants understand the minimal risks associated with the survey and the study. Although, there are minimal risks it is still important to allow participants to opt out of the survey if needed. The written consent form will be the first page of the survey and will allow participants to either continue the survey or end the survey immediately. In the survey the respondent will respond yes or no to the first question asking:**

**“Did you agree to waive your right to didcumentation of consent?” Yes or NO**

**If the respondent answers no they will immediately terminate the survey and will not proceed with any other questions.**

**If the respondent answers yes, they will be able to continue with the survey.**

**VI. INTERNATIONAL PROJECTS**

A. Will the project be conducted outside the United States YES \_\_\_ NO X\_\_\_

**VII: OTHER AGENCIES**

A. Some projects require additional approvals beyond IRB/IRB approval (e.g., Office of Management and Budget for surveys in federal parks, Native American Tribal Councils, U.S. Food and Drug Administration, etc). List additional agencies where project approval has been obtained. Attach appropriate documentation. If materials are under review at these agencies indicate the review is in progress.

**VIII: Sponsored Programs**

Is this project seeking funding YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO X\_\_\_\_\_  
 Has Sponsored Programs been notified? YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO X\_\_\_\_\_

**IX: ONLINE COURSE COMPLETION**

List the names of all investigators and indicate the date(s) of completion for all investigators taking the Protection of Human Subjects from the National Institutes of Health on line class.

<http://cme.cancer.gov/clinicaltrials/learning/humanparticipant-protections.asp>

**FACULTY SPONSOR NOTE:** A copy of the completion certificate or other verification must be included for ALL investigators including laboratory assistants, observation observers, etc.

<b>Name of Investigator</b>	<b>Date of Course Completion</b>	<b>Certificate Number of Online Course</b>
William T. Schumaker	9.19.12	1002203
Allison J. L. Touchstone	9.11.08	90570

If this project will be submitted or will receive external funding, print out the last page sign on the following signature line using a pen, provide the date of submission, and mail it to:

Institutional Review Board  
 University of Idaho  
 POB 443010  
 Moscow, Idaho 83844-3010

**Institutional Review Board Approval**

**Office of Research Assurances**                      October 24, 2013  
**Institutional Review Board**  
875 Perimeter Drive, MS 3010  
Moscow ID 83844-3010  
Phone: 208-885-6162  
Fax: 208-885-5752  
irb@uidaho.edu

To: Allison Touchstone

Cc: Will Schumaker

From: Traci Craig, PhD

Chair, University of Idaho Institutional Review Board  
University Research Office  
Moscow, ID 83844-3010

Title: 'Administrator's Perspectives of  
Meridian School District PTE Magnet  
Programs, Instructors and Students'  
13-252

Project: 10/23/13

Approved: 10/22/14

Expires:

On behalf of the Institutional Review Board at the University of Idaho, I am pleased to inform you that the protocol for the above-named research project is approved as offering no significant risk to human subjects.

This approval is valid for one year from the date of this memo. Should there be significant changes in the protocol for this project, it will be necessary for you to resubmit the protocol for review by the Committee.

Traci Craig

**APPENDIX E**  
**HUMAN SUBJECTS CERTIFICATE**





**Certificate of Completion**

The National Institutes of Health (NIH) Office of Extramural Research certifies that **William Schumaker** successfully completed the NIH Web-based training course "Protecting Human Research Participants".

Date of completion: 09/19/2012

Certification Number: 1002203



**Certificate of Completion**

The National Institutes of Health (NIH) Office of Extramural Research certifies that **Allison Touchstone** successfully completed the NIH Web-based training course "Protecting Human Research Participants".

Date of completion: 09/11/2008

Certification Number: 90570