

Bethel University

Spark

All Electronic Theses and Dissertations

2014

Minnesota Public School Principals and Education Law

Barton C. Becker
Bethel University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://spark.bethel.edu/etd>



Part of the [Educational Leadership Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Becker, B. C. (2014). *Minnesota Public School Principals and Education Law* [Doctoral dissertation, Bethel University]. Spark Repository. <https://spark.bethel.edu/etd/54>

This Doctoral dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by Spark. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Spark.

Minnesota Public School Principals and Education Law

by
Barton Cole Becker

A dissertation submitted to the faculty of Bethel University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Education

Saint Paul, MN
2014

Approved by:

Advisor: Dr. Barry Sullivan

Reader: Dr. Michael Lindstrom

Reader: Dr. Annette Ziegler

© 2014
Barton Cole Becker
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

Abstract

This quantitative, exploratory, descriptive study extended the research of Magone (2007) and measured the perceptions of Minnesota public school principals, superintendents, and school district attorneys regarding education law. The focus of the study was to identify a) the areas of education law are considered essential for Minnesota public school principals to know; b) the areas of education law in which public school principals have the most immediate need for continuing education; c) the areas of education law are considered critical for inclusion, or to be given priority, in Minnesota principal licensure programs; d) the avenues for continuing education that are considered most convenient and efficient for Minnesota public school principals; and e) the differences, if any, in perceptions between Minnesota and Montana public school principals, superintendents, and school district attorneys. The domain of Exceptional Children and the individual areas of Suspensions/Expulsions, Harassment (student), Staff Evaluation, and Dismissal Procedures (staff) were found to be the most essential areas as well as those also needing continuing education. Tort Liabilities and Corporal Punishment, among many law areas, were found to be most critical for inclusion in Minnesota principal licensure programs. A full-day, in-district education law training once during the summer was found to be considered the most convenient and efficient continuing education avenue for Minnesota public school principals to attain new knowledge of education law.

For Eli, Ania, Maksim, and Evelyn

Acknowledgements

First and foremost, I give the greatest thanks to my Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ. May any good that comes from this work serve to honor and glorify Him.

Thank you to my fabulous committee: My advisor, Dr. Barry Sullivan, and readers, Dr. Mike Lindstrom and Dr. Annette Ziegler. Your guidance, counsel, and support over the last three years were indispensable, and I will be forever grateful to you all. It was an honor and a privilege to work with you!

Special thanks to Johnny Denbleyker, Patti Anderson (MASSP), Olivia Gault (MESPA), and Cathy Miller (MSBA) for your outstanding services, kindness, and cooperation.

Thank you to the outstanding faculty at Bethel University; specifically, Dr. Craig Paulson, Dr. John Greupner, and Dr. Mary Whitman. This is a superb graduate program, and it was a joy to participate in and complete.

Many thanks to my colleagues at Osseo Area Schools ISD 279 for their support over the years and willingness to participate in the field test.

And last, thank you to my parents, Jack and Gail; and most importantly, to my wife, Olga. There is no way on earth that I could have completed this without you, and with four children to care for, it took far more work on your part than mine.

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|----|
| Chapter I: Introduction | 14 |
| Introduction to the Problem | 14 |
| Background of the Study | 16 |
| Statement of the Problem | 19 |
| Purpose of the Study | 21 |
| Rationale | 21 |
| Research Questions | 22 |
| Significance of the Study | 25 |
| Definition of Terms | 27 |
| Assumptions and Limitations | 28 |
| Nature of the Study | 29 |
| Organization of the Remainder of the Study | 31 |
| Chapter II: Review of the Literature | 32 |
| History and Evolving Nature of Education Law | 32 |
| The Importance of Education Law to Principals | 38 |
| Principals' Needs for Education Law Knowledge | 43 |
| Improving Education Law Knowledge | 49 |
| Chapter III: Methodology | 54 |
| Philosophy and Justification | 54 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| Research Questions | 55 |
| Theoretical Framework | 55 |
| Variables | 56 |
| Hypotheses | 57 |
| Research Design Strategy | 59 |
| Measures | 61 |
| Sampling Design | 62 |
| Data Collection Procedures | 62 |
| Field Test | 63 |
| Pilot Test | 63 |
| Data Analysis | 64 |
| Limitations of Methodology | 66 |
| Ethical Considerations | 67 |
| Chapter IV: Results | 68 |
| Introduction | 68 |
| Survey Sample Characteristics and Response Rate | 68 |
| Survey Results – Part I: Demographic Information | 70 |
| Research Question and Hypothesis One | 74 |
| Research Question and Hypothesis Two | 96 |
| Research Question and Hypothesis Three | 114 |
| Research Question and Hypothesis Four | 121 |
| Research Question and Hypothesis Five | 141 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| Chapter V: Discussion, Implications, Recommendations | 145 |
| Overview of the Study | 145 |
| Research Questions | 146 |
| Conclusions | 147 |
| Implications | 153 |
| Recommendations for Practitioners | 154 |
| Recommendations for Academics | 155 |
| Concluding Comments | 156 |
| References | 158 |
| Appendix A Education Law Domains and Individual Areas | 169 |
| Appendix B Education Law Survey – 2013 | 172 |
| Appendix C Education Law Survey Comments | 192 |
| Appendix D Education Law Survey Email Introduction and Reminders | 195 |
| Appendix E IRB Informed Consent Form | 197 |
| Appendix F Permission from Michael Magone | 199 |

List of Tables

| | | |
|---------|---|----|
| Table 1 | Law Domains Ranked by Current Employment Position Groupings | 77 |
| Table 2 | Law Domains Ranked by District Student Enrollment Size Groupings | 78 |
| Table 3 | Individual Areas Ranked by Current Employment Position Groupings | 80 |
| Table 4 | Individual Areas Ranked by District Student Enrollment Size Groupings | 82 |
| Table 5 | Freedom of Speech by District Type | 86 |
| | Corporal Punishment by Years Experience in School Administration | 86 |
| Table 6 | Role of Police Liaison Officer by Position of Employment | 87 |
| | Employment Contracts by Position of Employment | 87 |
| | Collective Bargaining by Position of Employment | 87 |
| | Education Malpractice by Highest Completed Educational Degree | 88 |
| | Equal Employment Opportunity by District Type | 88 |
| | Role of a Police Liaison Officer by District Type | 88 |
| | Sexual Harassment (student) by Years Experience in School Administration | 88 |
| | Role of Police Liaison Officer by Number of Education Law Courses Taken | 89 |
| Table 7 | Section 1983 (Federal Tort–Constitutional Rights) Actions by Position of Employment | 90 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| School Fees by Position of Employment | 90 |
| Academic Sanctions for Students by Position of Employment | 90 |
| Reporting Child Abuse by Position of Employment | 90 |
| Public Access to School Facilities by Position of Employment | 91 |
| Open Meeting/Public Records Law by Position of Employment | 91 |
| School Finance by District Type | 91 |
| Desegregation by District Type | 91 |
| Section 1983 (Federal Tort-Constitutional Rights) Actions by Years Experience in School Administration | 92 |
| Academic Sanctions for Students by Years Experience in School Administration..... | 92 |
| Public Access to School Facilities by Years Experience in School Administration | 92 |
| Legal Research/Case Study Skills by Number of Education Law Courses Taken | 93 |
| Table 8 Compulsory Attendance by District Type | 93 |
| Table 9 Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act by the Number of Education Law Courses Taken | 94 |
| Table 10 Student Transportation by District Type | 94 |
| Supervision of Students by Years in Educational Administration | 94 |
| Intentional Torts by Years in Educational Administration | 95 |
| Table 11 Law Domains Ranked by Current Employment Position Groupings | 98 |
| Table 12 Individual Areas Ranked by Current Employment Position Groupings | 99 |
| Table 13 Dress Codes by Highest Completed Educational Degree | 101 |

| | | |
|----------|---|-----|
| | Search and Seizure by Years Experience in School Administration | 101 |
| | Corporal Punishment by Years Experience in School Administration | 101 |
| | Dress Codes by Years Experience in School Administration | 102 |
| | Corporal Punishment by Number of Education Law Courses Taken | 102 |
| Table 14 | Equal Employment Opportunity by District Type | 103 |
| | Leave Issues by District Type | 103 |
| | Staff Evaluation by District Type | 103 |
| | Collective Bargaining by District Type | 103 |
| | Sexual Harassment (student) by Years Experience in School Administration | 104 |
| | Staff Evaluation by Years Experience in School Administration | 104 |
| | Privacy or Other Constitutional Rights by Number of Education Law Courses Taken | 104 |
| Table 15 | Public Access to School Facilities by Highest Completed Educational Degree | 105 |
| | Residency Requirements by District Type | 105 |
| | Historical/Foundational Legal Knowledge of Schools by Number of Education Law Courses Taken | 105 |
| | Legal Research/Case Study Skills by Number of Education Law Courses Taken | 106 |
| | Church and State by Number of Education Law Courses Taken | 106 |
| | Residency Requirements by Number of Education Law Courses Taken | 106 |
| | School Fees by Number of Education Law Courses Taken | 106 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| Open Meeting/Public Records Law by Number of Education Law Courses Taken | 107 |
| Table 16 Education of EL Students by Highest Completed Educational Degree ... | 108 |
| School Attendance by Highest Completed Educational Degree | 108 |
| Textbook Selection by District Type | 108 |
| Compulsory Attendance by District Type | 108 |
| Censorship by District Type | 109 |
| School Attendance | 109 |
| Grading/Promotion by Number of Education Law Courses Taken | 109 |
| Education of EL Students by Number of Education Law Courses Taken | 109 |
| Copyright Law by Number of Education Law Courses Taken | 110 |
| Textbook Selection by Number of Education Law Courses Taken | 110 |
| Censorship by Number of Education Law Courses Taken | 110 |
| Table 17 Extra-Curricular Participation by District Type | 111 |
| Table 18 Privacy Rights by Highest Earned Educational Degree | 111 |
| Intentional Torts by Highest Earned Educational Degree | 112 |
| Negligence by District Type | 112 |
| Extra-Curricular Activities/Athletic Programs by District Type | 112 |
| Proper Maintenance of Buildings/Grounds by District Type | 112 |
| Extra-Curricular Activities/Athletic Programs by Number of Education Law Courses Taken | 113 |
| Proper Maintenance of Buildings/Grounds by Number of Education Law Courses Taken | 113 |

| | | |
|----------|--|-----|
| Table 19 | Law Domains Ranked by Current Employment Position Groupings | 116 |
| Table 20 | Individual Areas Ranked by Current Employment Position Groupings | 117 |
| Table 21 | Settings for Continuing Education by Current Employment Position Groupings | 124 |
| Table 22 | Settings for Continuing Education by District Student Enrollment Size Groupings – Superintendents | 125 |
| Table 23 | Settings for Continuing Education by District Student Enrollment Size Groupings – Principals | 127 |
| Table 24 | Settings for Continuing Education by District Student Enrollment Size Groupings – Assistant Principals | 128 |
| Table 25 | Regional Workshops by District Type | 130 |
| | In-District Training by Years Experience in School Administration | 130 |
| | Regional Workshops by District Type | 130 |
| Table 26 | Time Increments by Current Employment Position Groupings | 131 |
| Table 27 | Time Increments by District Student Enrollment Size Groupings – Superintendents | 134 |
| Table 28 | Time Increments by District Student Enrollment Size Groupings – Principals | 136 |
| Table 29 | Time Increments for by District Student Enrollment Size Groupings – Assistant Principals | 138 |
| Table 30 | Full-Day Education Law Training Once During the School Year by Highest Earned Educational Degree | 140 |
| | Series of Two-Hour Education Law Trainings During the School Year by District Type | 140 |
| Table 31 | Null Hypotheses Findings | 144 |

Chapter I

Introduction

Introduction to the Problem

Minnesota public school principals must be prepared for the complexities and ever-changing nature of education law. To understand the layers of intricacy associated with education law is merely the beginning; principals need to know the law and address accordingly the realities of a litigious society and the sustained financial and emotional costs associated with liability. Education law litigation has been on the rise across the nation for decades, and public school principals need the necessary preparation and ongoing education law updates to effectively serve and operate as educational leaders (Powers, 2007).

Over the previous 60 years, the decisions of the Supreme Court have dramatically impacted public education in the United States (Gullatt & Tollett, 1997; Newton, 2007). Landmark and historic Supreme Court rulings declared the doctrine of “separate but equal” unconstitutional regarding public education facilities (*Brown v. Board of Education, 1954*), ruled school-led prayer unconstitutional (*Engel v. Vitale, 1962*), and affirmed students’ First Amendment rights to free speech at school, declaring those rights are not “shed...at the schoolhouse gate” (*Tinker v. Des Moines, 1969*, para. 16). One of the many results of these rulings was legal activism found a home in public education and schools can and will be held accountable for their

actions after *Tinker* (Reglin, 1992).

In addition to Supreme Court rulings, a wave of federal legislation in the 1960s and 1970s transformed public education. Among the historic bills passed by Congress were the Civil Rights Act of 1964, The Elementary and Secondary Schools Act, The Education Amendments of 1972, The Rehabilitation Act of 1973, The Equal Educational Opportunities Act of 1974, and the Education for All Handicapped Children Act (Ravitch, 2000). Compounding this injection of thousands of pages of new federal laws into public education was the legislative activity at the state level. The state of Minnesota, for example, has grown from one state law in 1849 (Minnesota State Department of Education, 1968) to 32 chapters of state statutes for K-12 Education and 13 chapters of rules for the Minnesota Department of Education (Minnesota Office of the Revisor of Statutes, 2013). Each public school district, in turn, has created school board policies and procedures based upon federal law, state statutes and rules, and court rulings at all levels. As a result, laws written and passed at federal and state levels combined with state statutes and rules and a myriad of local school district policies have produced a legal quandary and created a legal context to public education that is more complex than ever before (Balch, Hofmeister, & Memory, 2008; Sparkman, 1990). Moreover, the existence of such layers of legislation has led to an “explosion” of litigation in the last generation that has greatly impacted the operation of public education (Richardson & Zirkel, 1989). And more than any single public school employee, it is the principal who is the first line of authority and legal responsibility (Gutierrez & Rossow, 2009). They “stand on the

front line and are assigned responsibility for all those under their care and supervision” (Eberwein, Militello, & Schimmel, 2009, p. 1). In the twilight shadow cast by the legacy of the Warren Court, within a society now engulfed by continuous state and federal legislation, legalism, liability and litigious action, knowledge of education law by school principals “is of extreme importance” (Protz, 2005, p. 15).

To prepare today’s public school principals and would-be principals for the rigors, complexities, and risks associated with their positions and education law, it is vital to identify the areas of existing and new education law which are critical for public school principals to know, the areas in which principals are most in need of new knowledge, the education law topics which need to be included and given top priority within principal licensure programs, and the avenues that are most convenient and efficient for public school principals to attain new and updated knowledge of education law.

Background of the Study

Education law is constantly in a state of change and it is critical for public school principals to understand and keep well-informed of new legal developments in areas that may impact how they are expected to perform their jobs (Doverspike, 1990). Sparkman (1990) argued that the legal landscape has changed dramatically. “Hardly a year goes by that the Supreme Court does not make a major ruling on an issue that has legal implications for schools” (p. 59). Since the 1954 ruling of *Brown v. Board of Education*, federal and state judicial rulings on cases involving public education have occurred at an alarming rate, impacting all areas of public education

(Benson, 2005). Moreover, federal and state legislation has related to or as a result of judicial rulings have added tens of thousands of pages of laws to public education over the past several decades (Hogan, 1985). One of these areas is special education, first addressed 1975 through the landmark passage of The Education for All Handicapped Education Act, a most comprehensive and widespread law which forever changed the educational structure given to students with special needs (Apling, Jones, & Smole, 2004). As a result, clear understanding and adherence of education law by public school principals is far more complex and by no means guaranteed. The research of Protz (2005) found that administrators were, at best, inconsistent in their knowledge and understanding of special education law and, by extension, practice, which places both principals and their respective school districts in jeopardy of falling out of alignment with legally mandated requirements. This is by no means the only research showing weak knowledge of education law by public school principals and administrators (Walsh, 2001).

Despite these realities, public school principals are expected to know the law and ignorance of education law is not a defense in respect to its violation (Moswela, 2008). Indeed, school districts have been and will continue to be held liable for damages for violating education law or not enforcing it (Walsh, 2001). Therefore, public school principals must possess essential knowledge, skills, and understandings of education law and its impact on daily school operations if they are to be effective practitioners (Gajda, 2008; Reglin, 1992). Moreover, the “explosion” of litigation which Richardson and Zirkel (1989) alluded to has only increased in the past two

decades, and lawsuits pertaining to educationally related issues continue to rise in the United States (Bain, 2009).

Given that public school principals assume substantial liability in today's legal environment (Doverspike, 1990) and that education law is ever-changing at federal and state levels (Gullatt & Tollett, 1997), Zahler (2001) researched specific education law topics that public school principals in the state of North Carolina should know. The study sought to identify education law topics that current North Carolina public school principals feel are most important for principals to know, education law topics that North Carolina public school superintendents feel are most important for principals to know, and education law topics that current North Carolina school district attorneys feel are most important for principals to know. To do this, education law topics were divided into six broad domains: exceptional children, student rights, teacher/employee issues, tort liabilities, miscellaneous, and academic issues. The study also sought to identify if differences exist between the views of elementary, middle and high school principals, as well as between superintendents and school district attorneys.

Magone (2007) extended the research of Zahler (2001) to the state of Montana and surveyed 109 public school superintendents, 153 public school principals, and six education law attorneys. In addition to determining the areas of education law deemed essential for Montana public school principals to know, Magone (2007) expanded the study to include the following questions:

- In which education law areas do public school principals have an

immediate need for knowledge?

- Which education law areas are critical for inclusion in a graduate-level principal certification program's required education law course?
- Which settings of education law continuing education opportunities are most convenient and effective for Montana public school principals?
- Which time increments of education law continuing education opportunities are most convenient and effective for Montana public school principals?
- Which sources of education law information and continuing education do principals most frequently use for general and immediate assistance?
- Which are a principal's most preferred sources for education law information and continuing education?
- What is the level of need for improved education law curriculum/content area alignment among the university system, state agencies, school board/administration organizations, and public/private school law attorneys?

This study will extend the research of Magone (2007) to the state of Minnesota (see permission from Magone in Appendix F).

Statement of the Problem

Education law is more complex today than ever before (Balch, Hofmeister, & Memory, 2008). Dozens of laws have been passed in recent decades, which include countless statutory mandates and regulations based upon constitutional principles and

common law expectations (Petzko, 2001). Education laws are constantly changing at both the federal and state level, leaving principals in the position to continuously react in order to conform to them all (Arnberger & Schoop, 2006; Hermann, 2002), a task labeled as “monumental” (Sparkman, 1990). Despite the rise in lawsuits pertaining to educationally-related issues (Mounts, 1998) and the increasing costs of legal counsel and litigation (Petzko, 2001), a national survey showed that a majority of school principals are uninformed or misinformed about school law issues (Eberwein, Militello, & Schimmel, 2009). In addition, few universities require undergraduate courses in education law and few principal licensure programs offer extensive training regarding the types of legal issues that educators need to know (Bain, 2009), and conflicting results exist regarding the perceptions of effectiveness of such legal training within principal licensure programs and (Valadez, 2005).

By knowing education law as well as types of situations which may result in liability, public school principals can be proactive in their decision-making and lessen the chances of acting contrary to education law and being involved in litigation (Doverspike, 1990). It is noted that “for contemporary principals, avoiding the courtroom is directly related to understanding school law and court decisions that affect the day-to-day operations of schools” (Mawdsley & Permuth, 2001, p. 29).

Therefore, there is a vital need to provide public school principals with in-depth knowledge of existing and new laws, and changes to the laws, pertaining to public education. To do this, the perceptions of public school administrators need to be gathered to identify the most essential education laws for principals to know, and

to determine which of those laws have the most immediate need for continuing education. In addition, there is an essential need to determine the topics of education law critical for inclusion, or to be given priority, in Minnesota principal licensure programs. Last, the most convenient and efficient methods for working principals to attain knowledge of essential education law must to be identified.

Purpose of the Study

In order to best prepare Minnesota public school districts, and specifically principals and would-be principals, to address the challenging and ever-changing nature of education law and the significant perils of education litigation, this study will ascertain the perceptions of Minnesota public school principals, superintendents, and Minnesota public school district attorneys regarding which areas of education law are essential for a Minnesota public school principal to know. This research will also identify where the most immediate needs exist for new education law knowledge. In addition, this research will identify which areas of education law are critical for inclusion, or to be given priority, in Minnesota principal licensure programs. And finally, this research will identify which avenues are most convenient and efficient for providing continuing education law knowledge to public school principals.

Rationale

Only by identifying a) the areas of education law which are critical for a public school principal to know, b) the areas of education law in which the most immediate needs exist for principals to gain new education law knowledge, c) which areas are critical for inclusion, or to be given priority, in Minnesota principal

licensure programs, and d) the most convenient and efficient means of delivering new education law knowledge to principals, can the problem be addressed.

It is hoped that this study will add to the body of research and provide additional knowledge regarding Minnesota administrators' perceptions of education law. It is also hoped that principal licensure programs in Minnesota might utilize the findings of this study to enhance and strengthen their existing education law courses to meet the specific needs of would-be principals based on this current and up-to-date information. In addition, using the results of this study, school districts working independently or in collaboration with the Minnesota Department of Education can deliver education law updates in the most convenient and efficient manner to their current principals. And, ultimately, with each of these elements in place, the practice of public school principals and public schools as a whole can become more aligned with current federal and state education law.

Research Questions

By surveying Minnesota public school principals, superintendents, and school district attorneys, this study provides answers to the following questions:

1. Which areas of education law are considered essential for Minnesota public school principals to know?
2. What are the areas of education law that public school principals have the most immediate need for continuing education?
3. Which topics of education law are considered critical for inclusion, or to be given priority, in Minnesota principal licensure programs?

4. What avenues for continuing education are considered most convenient and efficient for Minnesota public school principals to attain new knowledge of education law?
5. What, if any, differences in perceptions exist between Minnesota public school principals, superintendents, and school district attorneys and Montana public school principals, superintendents, and school district attorneys?

This study was conducted using following hypotheses:

1. There will be a positive correlation between the perceptions of principals, superintendents, and school district attorneys regarding the areas of education law considered essential for Minnesota public school principals to know.
2. There will be a positive correlation between the perceptions of principals, superintendents, and school district attorneys regarding the areas of education law that public school principals have the most immediate need for continuing education.
3. There will be a positive correlation between the perceptions of principals, superintendents, and school district attorneys regarding the topics of education law that are considered critical for inclusion, or to be given priority, in Minnesota principal licensure programs.
4. There will be a positive correlation between the perceptions of principals, superintendents, and school district attorneys regarding the avenues for

continuing education considered most convenient and efficient for Minnesota public school principals to attain new knowledge of education law.

5. There will be consistency between the perceptions of Minnesota principals, superintendents, and school district attorneys and Montana principals, superintendents, and school district attorneys.

The data were tested via the following null hypotheses:

1. There will be no significant correlation between the perceptions of principals, superintendents, and school district attorneys regarding the areas of education law essential for Minnesota public school principals to know.
2. There will be no significant correlation between the perceptions of principals, superintendents, and school district attorneys regarding the areas of education law that public school principals have the most immediate need for continuing education.
3. There is will be no significant correlation between the perceptions of principals, superintendents, and school district attorneys regarding the topics of education law that are considered critical for inclusion, or to be given priority, in Minnesota principal licensure programs.
4. There will be no significant correlation between the perceptions of principals, superintendents, and school district attorneys regarding the avenues for continuing education considered most convenient and efficient

for Minnesota public school principals to attain new knowledge of education law.

5. There will be inconsistency between the perceptions of Minnesota principals, superintendents, and school district attorneys and Montana principals, superintendents, and school district attorneys.

Significance of the Study

Many studies have been undertaken to measure knowledge of education law among public school administrators, finding mixed results ranging from average to poor (Braband, 2003; Caldwell, 1986; Copenhaver, 2005; Crockett, 1994; Davidson, 1999; Dunklee, 1985; Eberwein, 2008; Eberwein, Militello, & Schimmel, 2009; Kerrigan, 1987; Nwanne, 1986; Osborn, 1990; Power, 2007; Schmidt, 1987; Shaw, 1983; Smith, 1998; Smith, 2010; Valadez, 2005; Williams, 2005; Zahler, 2001). Given that ignorance of the law does not provide exemption from possible penalties (Bain, 2009) and the documented rise in lawsuits relating to public education in recent years (Mounts, 1999, as cited in Bain, 2009), the specific education law topics critical to a public school principal must be identified in order to address the gaps and general lack of knowledge of those law topics among public school principals. No significant study has been conducted in the state of Minnesota to gather the perspectives and perceptions of public school administrators regarding the most essential education law topics, nor has any significant study identified the areas of education law in which the most immediate need for continuing education exists, as well as the most convenient and efficient means to deliver new knowledge to

Minnesota public school principals.

Therefore, a definite need exists to determine which education law topics are most critical for a Minnesota public school principal to know. Moreover, given the findings of the aforementioned studies, which revealed education law knowledge of principals ranges from average to poor, it is hoped that Minnesota principal licensure programs may use the findings of this study to align their education law graduate coursework in order best prepare would-be principals to know education law. In addition, given the existence of liability and to address costly realities of education law litigation, Minnesota public school districts might utilize the findings of this study to prepare the desired avenues of education law training for their administrators, teachers, and school employees.

This study extended the research of Magone (2007), whose recommendations included conducting similar studies “on a regular basis in order to stay abreast of the most current needs and challenges facing school law education providers and consumers” (p. 132). In doing so, this study took place approximately six years after his and focused on a different state, Minnesota, as opposed to Montana. As a result, this new research collected perceptions of critical education law knowledge of public school principals in a state with different education laws, as legal mandates vary from state to state, and after a period of time where significant changes may have occurred within existing education laws, as such laws from all levels of government constantly change (Hermann, 2002).

Definition of Terms

Assistant Principal. Licensed principal who aides the principal in the overall administration of the school as described in Minnesota Statute 123B.147.

Assistant Superintendent. Licensed superintendent who aides the superintendent in leading and administering the school district as described in Minnesota Statute 123B.143.

Education Law. The body of federal and state statutes, federal regulations and state rules, and court cases at federal and state levels that govern public education and local policies.

Litigation. The act or process of making the subject of a lawsuit (litigating).

Principal. Lead educator of the school and is responsible for such duties as described in Minnesota Statute 123B.147: Provide administrative, supervisory, and instructional leadership; manage, operate, and evaluate the educational programs of the school.

Principal Licensure Program. Any college or university graduate level coursework program or principal preparation program which fulfills the state licensure requirements for the certification of principals for public school as described in Minnesota Statute 122A.14.

School District Attorney. An attorney licensed in the state of Minnesota who is directly employed by a Minnesota public school district as a general counsel or whose practice regularly includes the area of education law.

Superintendent. Lead educator of a school district and responsible for such duties as described in Minnesota Statute 123B.143: Supervise the schools in the district, report and make recommendations about their condition; recommend to the board employment and dismissal of teachers; annually evaluate each school principal assigned responsibility for supervising a school building within the district, superintend school grading practices and examinations for promotions; and make reports required by the commissioner.

Assumptions and Limitations

The following items include assumptions to this quantitative, exploratory, descriptive study:

1. The sample is representative of the total population of public school principals, superintendents, and school district attorneys within the state of Minnesota.
2. The data to be collected from the sample will accurately reflect their professional opinions.
3. The participants of this study will answer all of the survey questions honestly.

The following items include limitations to this quantitative, exploratory, descriptive study:

1. The study is limited to the state of Minnesota.
2. The study is limited to the perceptions of the respondents during the month of June in 2013.

3. The survey is limited to six domains and 64 areas of education law.
4. There is no control over the conditions by which the respondents completed the survey.

Nature of the Study

This is a quantitative, exploratory, descriptive study examining what, if any, differences in perceptions exist between Minnesota principals, superintendents, and Minnesota school district attorneys regarding essential education law knowledge for public school principals by examining the following questions:

1. Which areas of education law are considered essential for Minnesota public school principals to know?
2. What are the areas of education law that public school principals have the most immediate need for continuing education?
3. Which topics of education law are considered critical for inclusion, or to be given priority, in Minnesota principal licensure programs?
4. What avenues for continuing education are considered most convenient and efficient for Minnesota public school principals to attain new knowledge of education law?
5. What, if any, differences in perceptions exist between Minnesota public school principals, superintendents, and school district attorneys and Montana public school principals, superintendents, and school district attorneys?

This study utilizes a close variation of the three-part online survey primarily

designed by Magone (2007), which extended prior research and gather descriptive feedback of Minnesota public school principals (see Appendix B). It was accomplished using an online, cross-sectional survey that gathered descriptive data regarding six domains of education law topics (Exceptional Children, Student Rights, Teacher and Employee Issues, Tort Liabilities, Miscellaneous, and Academic Issues). The data indicates which areas of education law are most essential for a Minnesota public school principal to know, the areas of education law in which the most immediate need for new knowledge exists, which areas of education law are critical for inclusion in Minnesota principal licensure programs, and which avenues for continuing education are most convenient and efficient to attain new education law knowledge. The survey was distributed by email to public school principals, superintendents, and school district attorneys within the state of Minnesota. This was accomplished through a partnership with the Minnesota Association of Secondary School Principals (MASSP), the Minnesota Elementary School Principals Association (MESPA), the Minnesota Department of Education (MDE), and the Minnesota School Boards Association's (MSBA) Council of School Attorneys.

The online descriptive survey includes three sections: 1) Demographic Information (gender, experience, education level, education law coursework, school/district enrollment size, and education law workshops); 2) Important Areas of Education Law for Principals (regarding the importance of, and immediate need for, training in education law knowledge areas for principal as well as which education law areas are critical for inclusion in graduate level principal preparation program

required education law coursework); and 3) Continuing Education for Principals (regarding the most often used and preferred methods and means for principals to obtain education law continuing education). The data were collected from the respondents and results analyzed to gather specific percentages and compare the perceptions of principals, superintendents, and school district attorneys.

Organization of the Remainder of the Study

The organization of the remainder of the study is achieved in five chapters, references, and appendixes. Chapter Two presents a review of literature focusing on four categories: the history and changing nature of education law, education law and its importance to public school principals, the varying needs of education law knowledge for principals, and the needs of principals for increasing knowledge of education law. Chapter Three describes the research design and methodology of the study; including philosophy and justification; variables; measures; data collection procedures; data analysis; and ethical considerations. Data analysis and comparison to the findings of Magone (2007) are found in Chapter Four. Chapter Five contains the summary and conclusions of the study as well as recommendations for further research relating to the study. The references and appendixes conclude the study.

Chapter II

Review of the Literature

The review of the literature is organized into the following four categories: a) history of and the changing nature of education law, b) education law and importance to public school principals, c) the varying needs of education law knowledge for principals, and d) the needs of principals for increasing knowledge of education law.

History and Evolving Nature of Education Law

According to the 1968 report, “A History of the State Department of Education in Minnesota,” the first law pertaining to education in Minnesota was enacted by the territorial legislature in 1849 and declared that “common schools were to be open to all persons between the ages of four and 21 years, and townships were to be divided into school districts when the districts contained more than five families” (Minnesota State Department of Education, p. 5). The law also “levied a general tax of 2½ mills and supplemented it with 15 per cent (sic) of the funds collected from liquor licenses and fines for criminal offenses” (p. 5).

Upon achieving statehood in 1858, one of the first acts of the Minnesota state legislature was to appoint a state superintendent of public instruction. The legislature adopted a neighborhood plan in 1862 which established the district system of public schools and by 1900 Minnesota had roughly 8,000 school districts. Statutes were enacted in 1885 to address the lack of school attendance among children, “requiring

every parent or guardian of a child between the ages of 8 and 18 to send him to a public or private school for 12 weeks each year” (p. 6). Further statutes were enacted in 1899 to strengthen the compulsory attendance law and to address chronic truancy. The legislative session of 1899 also witnessed the passage of the first education laws to address teacher qualifications. Statutes “required that prospective teachers take an examination prepared by the office of public instruction, and that upon satisfactory completion of the test the teacher be issued one of three certificates, depending on academic and professional preparation” (p. 7).

A 1915 cumulative report detailed all Minnesota education laws enacted by the state legislatures up to that year. Included among the 14 education law subjects were the election, organization and qualifications of school boards and officers; school district taxes and limitations of; state aid to schools and regulation of; school textbooks and selection processes; compulsory education and truancy processes; school administration, organization of roles, and teacher qualifications, contracts, and training (Williams, 1915).

Special education, then referred to as the education of handicapped children, was addressed by the state legislature for the first time in 1915. Increased aid was given to Minnesota school districts who established “special classes for handicapped children” (Minnesota State Department of Education, p. 32). And in 1955, the state legislature created the Interim Commission on Handicapped Children to create a comprehensive and detailed report on the problems of education for handicapped children. “The Commission recommended, among other things, the enactment of a

law requiring every school district to provide special instruction and services to every handicapped child requiring them and providing for adequate state aid to implement the program” (p. 32). This law was passed by the state legislature in 1957, and by 1965 every county in Minnesota had at least one type of special education program.

In addition to the creation of the first public education law statutes in Minnesota and other states within the country, Hogan (1985) found that judicial activism in public education evolved over several distinctive periods throughout our nation’s history. From 1789 to 1850, state and federal courts rarely heard cases involving public education and there was very little judicial activity during these 61 years. From 1850 to 1950, judicial involvement increased, but at the state level only—consistent with the Constitution, which makes no mention of public education and complimented by the 10th Amendment, which yields powers “reserved to the States respectively, or to the people” (U.S. Const. amend. X, para. 1). However, state and federal court involvement in public education erupted in the 1950s, specifically with the Warren Court’s 1954 landmark ruling of *Brown v. Board of Education*, and continues through the present day. Between 1972 and 2004, over 100 Supreme Court decisions shaped public education in America (Benson, 2005), and this activism was matched and surpassed by federal and state legislation from the 1960s through today (Hogan, 1985).

Federal legislative reforms focusing on public education began in earnest following The Civil Rights Act of 1964. From this landmark act came laws to end all racial segregation as well as desegregation forced busing in the early 1970s. President

Lyndon Johnson signed into law The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, among the most far-reaching federal legislation ever passed by Congress (Ravitch, 2000). Adding to the growing legal complexity of public education were several laws passed to address inequities of gender and students with disabilities. Congress passed The Educational Amendments of 1972, which included Title IX, a statute prohibiting any discrimination on the basis of sex. Few pieces of legislation had a greater impact on public education and the increased responsibility of school officials to know and abide by new legislation (Ware, 2006).

In 1973 Congress passed The Rehabilitation Act, a consequential law that included section 504, requiring public school districts to provide a "free appropriate public education" to each qualified student with a disability within the school district's jurisdiction, regardless of the nature or severity of the disability (H.R. 8070, 1973). The following year Congress passed The Equal Educational Opportunities Act of 1974, mandating school districts "to take action to overcome students' language barriers that impede equal participation in educational programs" (Ravitch, 2000). One year later in 1975, Congress passed The Education for All Handicapped Children Act, among the most significant and comprehensive laws in the history of public education (Apling, Jones, & Smole, 2004). It was expanded in 1986 and 1990—when it was renamed the Individuals with Disabilities Act—again in 1997, and most recently in 2004 when it was again renamed as the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004 (Essex, 2008).

Adding to the layers of new legislation for public education was the reaction

to the April 1983 report by the National Commission on Excellence in Education, titled, “A Nation at Risk.” Ravitch (2000) detailed the new reform efforts at the federal level which followed “A Nation at Risk” through the end of the 20th century and added to the rapidly growing litany laws, programs and agendas in public education. Motivated by frustration and disagreement with the multiculturalism and self-esteem movements from the 1970s, efforts began to develop national standards in History, English, and Math. Out of “progressivism” grew “constructionism” and a renewed effort to create a student-centered environment, rather than a teacher-led environment using standards-based and outcome-based education philosophies.

In 1990, under President George H. W. Bush, the 50 state governors began work on national education goals for the year 2000 (Ravitch, 2000). This work culminated in 1994 when President Clinton signed into law the Goals 2000: Educate America Act, which intended to boost teaching and learning by creating a “national framework” for education reform, and to achieve systemic changes essential for equitable and high levels of academic achievement for American students (H.R. 1804, 1994). Goals 2000 was discontinued and replaced in January 2002 with the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB), the most sweeping public education reform law in a generation, which aimed to have every student in America test at grade level by the year 2014 (H.R. 1, 2002). By 2008, then-Senator Barack Obama had declared his goals of overhauling NCLB and replacing it with new public education reform legislation (Obama, 2008). Clearly, Williams (1994) had ample support to declare that “the evidence of the legalization of education is irrefutable” (p. 4).

Apart from such landmark pieces of legislation, education law continues to change and evolve every year (Brabrand, 2003). Benson (2005) analyzed 96 Supreme Court cases involving public education from 1972 to 2004, finding that more than half of the decisions ruled completely against the existing public education policies. Magone (2007) noted that these rulings most likely resulted in significant policy and procedural adjustments. Moreover, since the structure of public education is decentralized, it is rare that one law prevails in all states (Alexander, 2009). The result of yearly actions by the judicial and legislative branches of government at the state and federal level is a complex and confusing legalistic reality for public school principals (Sparkman, 1990).

One example of the evolving and consistently changing nature of education law is the issue freedom of speech in school. The Supreme Court cases of *Tinker v. Des Moines* (1969), *Bethel v. Fraser* (1986), *Hazelwood v. Kuhlmeier* (1988), and *Morse v. Frederick* (2007) document how the opinions of the Court can require public schools to significantly adjust their policies when faced with issues of student freedom of speech. In a broad and open-ended decision, *Tinker* held that free speech is allowed during the school day so long as a substantial disruption to the educational process did not occur (*Tinker v. Des Moines*, 1969). This ruling significantly altered the relationship between school administration and students and mandated significant changes in policy and procedure. However, each of the ensuing cases placed clear limits on student expression and retracted the scope of the *Tinker* ruling—*Bethel*, in terms of vulgar, obscene and sexually suggestive speech; *Hazelwood*, in terms of

ensorship of a student newspaper; and *Morse*, in terms of references to illegal substances (Essex, 2008). To that end, Alexander and Alexander (2009) noted, “The evolution of the law gives new shape to the public schools that emerge from the social forces that prescribe and portend the direction of the law” (p. xlii).

In addition to new federal legislation and Supreme Court decisions, changes to school policies and procedures stem from lower court decisions, new state legislation, and inter-district activities such as school board meetings (Essex, 2008; Magone, 2007). Indeed, the laws governing the operation of schools and the respective policies created to enforce the laws are in a state of constant flux (Arnberger & Shoop, 2006).

The Importance of Education Law to Principals

Hulsizer (1987) directly stated that public education is on trial. According to Richardson and Zirkel (1989), the number of lawsuits involving education law has “exploded.” There were more cases during the 1970s alone than there were from 1800 to 1969, and there was a 20% increase in education-related cases between the mid-1980s and the mid-1990s (Valente, 1994). Nearly every decision of a public school principal poses legal consequences (Foldesy & King, 1995) and successful job performance is increasingly dependent upon a clear grasp and appropriate application of education law (Balch, Hofmeister & Memory, 2008). Essex (2008) argued that educational leaders must “exercise discretion” while making decisions which undoubtedly will impact students and staff under their responsibility (p. xi). A superficial understanding and application of education law has become increasingly inadequate for school districts and school principals in particular; circumstances and

realities have created the necessity for principals to become legal experts (Doverspike, 1990). Principals and their administrative teams operating in absence of such conditions face substantial risk as the number of lawsuits and litigation costs in public education are noticeably on the rise (Mounts, 1998).

Sametz (1983) noted the increasing complexity of society as a whole and specifically public education in terms of its legal environment. In a study to determine the amount of educational law mandated by different states during undergraduate and graduate preservice teacher certification programs, Gullatt and Tollett (1997) found a substantial increase in the number of education law disputes reaching the court system. They argued that due to national and state bureaucracy, the conditions and environment exist for frequent litigation surrounding public education. Thus, educational leaders—specifically principals—must be aware of requirements mandated by the courts and legislatures.

Moswela (2008) found that simply working in public education exposed an individual to civil liabilities. Claiming that knowledge of education law has become “an imperative,” he argued that without basic knowledge of the legal implications of one’s actions, one can inadvertently find themselves on the wrong side of the law. Focusing on the issue of negligence, Permuth (1998) called for public school principals to obtain a broad understanding of negligence in terms of anticipating and responding to situations that could lead to potential lawsuits. Moreover, given the differences in state education law, he cautioned the need for principals to know state statutes and provisions for their own protection from liability.

Petzko (2001) warned of the growing amounts of money spent by school districts on legal counsel and litigation and of the vital necessity for educational leaders to know education law in order to act based upon sound understanding and application of the law. With public education functioning in an increasingly complex legal environment, the costs of unpreparedness far outweigh the risks. She writes of the principals who, in addition to themselves, “endeavor to prevent litigation by ensuring that the entire faculty is aware of legal issues and how to avoid conflict” (p. 34).

Despite these concerns, Lehigh University Professor Perry Zirkel argued that US courts are more likely to favor schools and have been since the 1980s. He cited the presidency of Ronald Reagan and his appointment of conservative judges which reshaped the manner in which the court system viewed education law cases. Supreme Court decisions and lower court decisions consistently ruled in favor of schools more than half the time, specifically in cases involving student rights and teacher rights. However, Zirkel acknowledged that the cost of resources in time and money may not be worthwhile, even in victory (Coeyman, 2003).

Despite this apparent trend shifting in favor of schools, the topic of special education law is among the most complex and affords a significant liability to public schools and educational leaders. Protz (2005) conducted a study of special education law knowledge among public school employees and found the number of students with special needs increases, so does the risk of possible litigation. Moreover, mistakes by school administrators can result in substantial litigation costs and

compromise the education of all students. “Given society’s propensity for lawsuits, knowledge of special education law is more important now than it has been historically” (p. 21).

Technology is a relatively new law topic within the context of the history of public education, but it has quickly become among the areas of education law most likely to have new legislation added or changes made to existing laws. Quinn (2003) warned of the need to be mindful of such emerging legal conditions and statutes, and of the importance for school principals and teachers to be routinely updated and kept abreast of the changing nature of the law. Failure to maintain solid understanding of the law in regards to technology could pose substantial risk with severe legal ramifications. Nevertheless, principals “can find it nearly impossible to keep up with the swiftly moving legal landscape in educational technology” (p. 187). Buckman and Wood (2002) warned that “the laws have not kept up with the Internet explosion” (p. 1).

Concern exists regarding the increasing financial and emotional costs of education law litigation (Harris, 2001). Districts absorb the costs of lawsuits, regardless of the ruling, which ranged from \$45,000 to \$400,000 per year and over \$200 million nationally (Noffke & Underwood, 1990). Gajda (2008) warned of the risks posed by educational leaders and teachers who lacked legal literacy, claiming this could lead to victimization by parties with superior legal knowledge. In addition, Stewart (1998) found that in the course of managing legal matters, principals and educational leaders experienced a high level of stress while addressing legal issues,

especially when accompanied with a lack of education law knowledge and concern of legal repercussions. A correlation between these statements exists with the findings of Eberwein, Militello, and Schimmel (2009), who reported that 25% of secondary principals spent 3-6 hours per week preparing to avoid litigation.

Reglin (1992) provided a stern warning to educational leaders that they ignore the law at their own peril. With the hundreds of decisions made each year by educators, any of those decisions and actions can render them defendants in the court of law. Administrators have reported the decisions to eliminate programs because of liability concerns (Joyce, 2000). He stated that 1,200 to 3,000 lawsuits are brought against educational staff members every year, where the very real outcome of financial penalty looms large. Even in victory, educators face the personal costs of lost time, the stigma of public accusation, and the expenses from attorney fees. “The staggering increase in lawsuits is a major indicator that people want somebody to pay when things do not work out evenly or fairly in their lives” (p. 32).

Due to the sustained expansion of education law brought on by landmark Supreme Court decisions in the 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s, it is more imperative now than ever that public school principals and educational leaders gain broad and in-depth knowledge of education law in order to best avoid a scenario where they find themselves on the wrong side of the law. Thus, for the public school principal to succeed in their position, they must have a solid grasp of education law, specifically areas relating to the legal rights and responsibilities of the position of school principal (Magone, 2007).

Principals' Needs for Education Law Knowledge

Stringent recommendations for well-rounded knowledge of education law by public school principals are numerous. Armentia (1999) called for educational leaders to routinely attend seminars on school law at national, regional and state levels as well as maintain subscriptions to newsletters or publications, but also to maintain and increase use of the Internet as “a valuable resource that provides immediacy in learning about the latest litigation” (p. 21). Balch, Hofmeister, and Memory (2008) argued that the quality of our education system is dependent upon educational leaders being responsive to the legal context of education, thus requiring “a sound awareness and prudent application of education law” (p. 5). Dickensen and Miller (2006) called for school personnel to keep current in case law and alter their practices accordingly. Gray, Herlihy, and McCollum (2002) warned of the risks of liability and the need for educational leaders to be cognizant of legal rulings and ramifications. And Taylor (2003) referred to the effective principal of today as a “legal eagle—someone who must not only appreciate the pedagogical requirements of the principalship but also the increasingly important legal ins and outs” (p. 66).

Arnberger and Schoop (2006) argued for principals and school leaders to keep their professional knowledge of education law current in order “to reach legally correct decisions and avoid unnecessary conflict during the discipline phase of school leadership” (p. 20), and to complete the “challenging task of protecting the rights of all students while at the same time providing appropriate discipline” (p. 21) for students receiving special education services. Additionally, Permuth (1998)

advocated for the updated and increased knowledge principals must obtain about state statutes to understand what provisions exist to provide protection during disciplinary actions. And Yurek (1996) also called for principals to have a solid understanding of special education law as the complexity of the legislation continues to increase.

On the topic of free speech in schools, Baule and Kriha (2008) called for administrators to ensure both they and their teaching staff maintains awareness of “what constitutes genuinely inappropriate behavior for which disciplinary action is appropriate and what are simple cases of adolescents expressing their free speech” (p. 24). Additionally, Draa and Sydney (2009) also strongly recommended that educational leaders understand the legal framework regarding free speech in schools and what constitutes a substantial disruption of the educational process. And Hoover (1998) stressed the need for principals to ensure they and their journalism teachers understand the basic concepts of *Hazelwood*.

Brooks, Gomez, and McNamara (2006) advocated for school administrators to remain informed about the rapidly evolving aspects of education law pertaining to electronic media and personal expression. Gavitt, Perks, and Olivo (1997) called for additional trainings as the risk of liability increases substantially with the role the Internet plays in education.

Doverspike (1990) underscored how much the job of a public school principal has changed since *Tinker v. Des Moines* and that a principal’s legal knowledge must “go beyond a shallow, mechanical level so that a fuller appreciation of liability risks can be reached” (p. 1). Gutierrez and Rossow (2009) recognized the necessity of

principals to be informed of school legal policy decisions regarding their role as an instructional and curricular leader. Moreover, Hermann (2002) noted that as legal mandates vary from state to state, it is imperative for educational leaders to be knowledgeable about relevant state statutes and case law. And Williams (2005) underscored the need for administrators to have specific knowledge, training, and skills in order to ensure they act within the constraints of the law posed by legislation, regulation, and litigation in order to comply with federal and state laws and district directives.

Sparkman (1990) encouraged educational leaders to develop an appreciation of the law and the legal system, rather than view them as a potential threat. Moreover, he found it critical for leaders to understand both the legal basis of their authority and the limitations of their position, arguing that principals must comprehend the legal relationship between the school district and the state. In addition, Taylor (2010) confirmed that today's public school principals and educational leaders are increasingly expected to have a firm grasp of case law and legal terminology. This includes basic understanding of seminal legal cases and rulings, the limits of their authority to administer in various scenarios, and the general responsibilities of their role as principals from a legal perspective. Essex (2008) depicted the difficulty and complexity of this understanding, given the expectation of courts for educational leaders to function within the legal framework set forth by the U.S. Constitution, federal law, state constitutions, state laws, case law and statutory law from both state and federal levels. And finally, Alexander and Alexander (2009) warned of the

necessity for educational leaders to be knowledgeable in basic concepts of the American legal system in order to apply their knowledge within their jobs.

Yet, despite the existence of these repeated recommendations, warnings, and contentions, numerous studies have found that, in many cases, legal knowledge of educational leaders and principals is marginal. Caldwell (1986) conducted a survey of Virginia school principals to determine their knowledge level of education law and found the average score was 78.1%. Brabrand (2001) followed the recommendation of Caldwell to periodically repeat the study and found the knowledge level of Virginia principals had noticeably fallen to 73.3%. In addition, 18% of the survey respondents claimed to have been involved with litigation during their time as principal. Among his recommendations was the call for “school divisions and university preparation programs to determine what specific areas of school law should be addressed in school inservice training and university curriculum” (p. 67).

Kerrigan (1987) developed a 24-question survey for 300 Massachusetts principals covering education law and policy as well as the legal role responsibilities of a public school principal. The findings indicated school administrators—principals at the elementary, middle and high school levels—“did not feel adequately informed about the laws that affected them and their schools” (p. 1), despite the clear need to be richly informed of critical education laws. Additionally, administrators strongly believed possession of such knowledge of fundamental legal principles regarding education law would assist them in making sound administrative decisions. The findings also indicated that administrative training of principals should include

courses, seminars or workshops on educational law and policy.

Mata (1998) surveyed 761 Pennsylvania public school principals via a 19-question survey, directly derived from Pennsylvania statutes, regulations, and court decisions. The results produced an average score of 56.8%, revealing principals to have “appeared confounded by the legally complex nature of the laws” (p. 1). Moreover, the findings showed principals were not knowledgeable of the legal procedures regarding issuing unsatisfactory ratings or the process of teacher dismissals. Recommendations included improved and ongoing education for principals covering the changing nature of education law and specifically in the areas of teacher dismissals.

In a study to assess the knowledge of Tennessee public school principals of Public Law 92-142, then known as The Education for All Handicapped Education Act, Hirth (1988) revealed significant gaps in principals’ knowledge of special education law. She found this lack of knowledge alarming given the trend in the late 1980s toward greater integration of regular and special education students into systemic educational delivery. Hirth concluded that "principals' knowledge of special education law is not sufficient to ensure that mistakes in implementation of procedural safeguards and/or the provision of educational services will not occur" (p. 136).

Copenhaver (2005) extended the study of Hirth to assess the knowledge of North Carolina principals’ knowledge of special education law after the 1990 and 1997 reauthorizations of Public Law 94-142, renamed the Individuals with

Disabilities Education Act. Similar to Hirth (1988), the results revealed an average score of 68% among North Carolina public school principals. Among the recommendations was a call for significant improvements in special education law courses within North Carolina's principal preparation programs.

Schlosser (2006) performed a survey to assess the level of school law knowledge of principal interns in Texas; in all, 362 respondents from 21 different Texas principal preparation programs participated in the survey. Results showed an average score of 70% and, moreover, there were significant findings that the interns believed the area of education law in their respective principal preparation program needed to be strengthened.

Smith (2010) conducted a survey to measure the legal knowledge of Arkansas public school principals in seven different areas: a) law, b) constitutional issues, c) discipline, d) employee relations, e) federal law, f) special education, and g) tort liability. Participation included 332 respondents to the 84-question survey, yielding an average score of 70.83%. Among the findings included the highest scores being earned by principals who received their education law training more than 10 years prior to the study and who had more than 12 years of administrative experience. A strong recommendation was given to instill collaboration between state educational associations and the Arkansas public university system as well as offer a statewide professional development model to provide greater education to Arkansas principals in the area of education law.

Eberwein, Militello, and Schimmel (2009) conducted a vast study in

collaboration with the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) to determine secondary school principals' knowledge of education law in four areas: a) the rights of students and teachers, b) how often principals are legally threatened and sued, c) how they adjust their behaviors in response, and d) how they obtain and disseminate legal information. Nearly 500 secondary school principals from across the United States participated in the 34-question survey. Based on the results, which ranged from 10% correct to 98% correct, 85% of the respondents stated they would change their professional behavior as a result of learning the answers to the questions in the survey. Moreover, principals wanted more education about the rights and responsibilities of their students and teachers. Final recommendations called for comprehensive preservice educational law courses, regular professional development updates, user-friendly resources, and access to the legal counsel of the district.

With strong evidence of the need for the public school principal of today to possess clear and substantial education law knowledge, yet study after study demonstrating that principals in multiple states have average understanding at best, a clear need exists for an educational tool to better equip public school principals with essential knowledge of education law.

Improving Education Law Knowledge

Gullat and Tollett (1997) listed four critical reasons to emphasize education law in undergraduate and graduate education programs for teachers and administrators. The first reason was to address the overwhelming proliferation of lawsuits involving schools and education personnel. Second was due to the findings

of Patterson and Rossow (1996) which reported that few education preparation programs include formal courses containing details about legal rights and professional responsibilities of educators. The third reason was due to the considerable changes in public education by the landmark Supreme Court decisions of the 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s, in addition to the wave of groundbreaking legislation in the 1970s which drastically broadened the obligations of public schools. And finally, the fourth reason was to provide consistent updates and new knowledge regarding the newly enacted education legislation by the state and federal governments.

While the critical importance of education law knowledge has been clearly defined (Gajda, 2008; Gullat & Tollett, 1997), debate exists regarding the overall effectiveness of university principal preparation programs. Levine (2005) conducted an extensive, four-year study of principal preparation programs across the country, gathering the perspectives of thousands of faculty, students, deans and alumni regarding the quality of preparation delivered through their various programs. The findings of the study revealed the overall quality of principal preparation programs to be substantially lacking, even poor. Factoring into this conclusion were a) the rise in number of institutions offering educational administration and principal preparation programs, b) an increase in pressure to award doctoral degrees in educational administration, c) the competition to enroll students into educational administration and principal preparation programs were lowering the overall quality, and d) the standardized system of awarding teacher and administrator salary increases based upon attainment of post-bachelor graduate credits, resulting in teachers and

administrators seeking the most amount of credits through programs with the least amount of academic expectations.

Adding to the concern of the quality of principal preparation programs is evidence that graduate-level education law courses do not equip would-be principals with the critical knowledge needed to serve in the role of a public school principal. Hingham, Littleton, and Styron (2001) found that only 23 states have education law training requirements for principals. Lamkin (2006) also found education law to be a topic with a systemic lack of training for educators and educational leaders. This is especially troubling given the findings of Militello (2006), who surveyed administrators and reported education law as one of the topics given highest priorities for desired additional training (as cited in Eberwein, Militello, & Schimmel, 2009).

Hoyle (2007), on the other hand, in responding directly to the findings of Levine (2005), argued that principal preparation programs are as strong as they have ever been. Evidence exists to support this claim in the study completed by Daresh (1997), which found several strategic initiatives created in order to systematically improve principal preparation. Among them included a collaborative effort by the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) and the National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP) identify, recruit and effectively train future principals, and an initiative sponsored by the Danforth Foundation to support new and innovative principal training programs.

The state of Minnesota does not place a specific requirement on the number of education law courses a prospective principal must complete. Rather, each principal

preparation program is granted the latitude to determine their own course schedule to prepare each student in their effort to demonstrate competence and proficiency in 13 core leadership competencies as determined by the state of Minnesota (Minnesota Board of School Administrators, 2011). The fourth competency relates specifically to education law:

A person who serves as a superintendent, principal, director of special education, or director of community education shall demonstrate competence in the following core areas:

D. Policy and law by:

(1) developing, adjusting, and implementing policy to meet local, state, and federal requirements and constitutional provisions, standards, and regulatory applications;

(2) recognizing and applying standards of care involving civil and criminal liability for negligence, harassment, and intentional torts; and

(3) demonstrating an understanding of state, federal, and case law governing general education, special education, and community education (Chapter 3512, Part 0510).

Zahler (2001) and Magone (2007) conducted surveys in North Carolina and Montana, respectively, to determine the perceptions of public school administrators regarding the most essential education law topics for a public school principal to know. Specific law topics were grouped into six broad domains: a) Exceptional Children, b) Student Rights, c) Teacher/Employee Issues, d) Tort Liabilities, e)

Miscellaneous, and f) Academic Issues. In the findings of both studies, the laws within the domain of Exceptional Children were ranked as the most important for public school principals to know. Student Rights and Teacher and Employment Issues gathered the second and third most significant results, respectively.

Magone (2007) proceeded to determine the most effective avenue as a means for working principals to attain new and updated education law knowledge. Montana administrators who responded to the survey chose between the following options: a) In-district training, b) Regional workshops, c) State-level workshops, d) Additional graduate-level coursework, and e) Video-conferencing or online format. Data were collected regarding the convenience of each option as well as effectiveness in terms of being able to deliver the desired content. Overwhelmingly, the option of In-district training was selected as the most highly convenient (65%) and highly effective (70%).

With the necessity of public school principals to possess strong knowledge of education law, the need for effective and relevant principal preparation programs to train prospective principals is more important than ever. Once principals, having attained their licenses, earn a position in a public school district, efficient and convenient avenues must be created for new education law knowledge can be obtained regarding changes to existing laws, new case law decisions, and new education law legislation. The risks of liability in public education are too high to ignore, creating the critical need for principals to remain abreast of the most recent education law knowledge.

Chapter III

Methodology

Philosophy and Justification

The legal landscape within public education, and specifically the role of the principal, has changed dramatically since the 1960s (Sparkman, 1990). Moreover, in the past two decades, multiple studies of public school administrators across the United States have suggested a lack of fundamental understanding of education law (Eberwein, Militello, & Schimmel, 2009). Such findings convey the vital importance of determining the areas of education law that are critical for public school principals to know, and to identify which of those laws current public school principals are most in need of knowledge (Taylor, 2003). This study adds to the existing knowledge base by determining the perceptions of public school principals within the state of Minnesota regarding these areas, in addition to identifying laws which are critical for inclusion in education law coursework within principal certification programs, and identifying the most convenient and efficient manner for working principals to attain new and updated knowledge on critical areas of education law.

This chapter is divided in the following sections: a) philosophy and justification, b) research questions, c) theoretical framework, d) variables, e) hypotheses, f) research design strategy, g) measures, h) sampling design, i) data collection procedures, j) field test, k) pilot test, l) data analysis, m) limitations of

methodology, and n) ethical considerations.

Research Questions

This quantitative, exploratory, descriptive study seeks to identify the perceptions of, and correlations between, Minnesota public school principals, superintendents, and school district attorneys regarding essential education law knowledge for public school principals by exploring the following questions:

1. Which areas of education law are considered essential for Minnesota public school principals to know?
2. What are the areas of education law that public school principals have the most immediate need for continuing education?
3. Which topics of education law are considered critical for inclusion, or to be given priority, in Minnesota principal licensure programs?
4. What avenues for continuing education are considered most convenient and efficient for Minnesota public school principals to attain new knowledge of education law?
5. What, if any, differences in perceptions exist between Minnesota public school principals, superintendents, and school district attorneys and Montana public school principals, superintendents, and school district attorneys?

Theoretical Framework

This study utilized a close variation of the three-part survey, originally designed by Zahler (2001) to identify a) education law topics that North Carolina

public school principals felt were most important for public school principals to know, b) education law topics that North Carolina public school superintendents feel are most important for principals to know, and c) education law topics that current North Carolina school district attorneys feel are most important for principals to know. The survey was extended by Magone (2007) to the state of Montana and expanded to identify a) the areas of education law that Montana principals perceived an immediate need to new knowledge, b) the means which were most convenient and efficient for attaining such knowledge, and c) the areas of education law deemed critical for inclusion in education law coursework within principal licensure programs.

This study extended prior research and gather descriptive feedback from Minnesota public school administrators, including principals, superintendents, and school district attorneys. The descriptive feedback includes the respondents' perceptions of the research questions.

Variables

Survey participants provided several demographic variables, including age, highest educational degree earned, experience in public school administration, and education law-related workshops attended. Independent variables will include the survey participants' preferences regarding the most important areas of education law of which to obtain new knowledge, and their partiality for the most convenient and efficient means of obtaining this new education law knowledge. These preferences were determined through a series of survey questions focused on education law. The

education law topics are divided into six domains: Student Rights, Teacher and Employment Issues, Miscellaneous, Academic Issues, Exceptional Children, and Tort Liabilities. Each of these domains were identified by questions in the survey that allowed for identifying the preferences the respondents had regarding each domain as well as specific topics within the domain.

Hypotheses

Magone (2007) found high consistencies between the data from his study when compared to that of Zahler (2001). Strong similarities of survey responses were found in both studies between principals and superintendents, despite the passage of six years' time. In both cases, the education law domain of Exceptional Children was ranked as the most important for public school principals to know, followed by Student Rights and Teacher and Employment Issues, respectively.

Therefore, this study was conducted using following hypotheses:

1. There will be a positive correlation between the perceptions of principals, superintendents, and school district attorneys regarding the areas of education law considered essential for Minnesota public school principals to know.
2. There will be a positive correlation between the perceptions of principals, superintendents, and school district attorneys regarding the areas of education law that public school principals have the most immediate need for continuing education.

3. There will be a positive correlation between the perceptions of principals, superintendents, and school district attorneys regarding the topics of education law that are considered critical for inclusion, or to be given priority, in Minnesota principal licensure programs.
4. There will be a positive correlation between the perceptions of principals, superintendents, and school district attorneys regarding the avenues for continuing education considered most convenient and efficient for Minnesota public school principals to attain new knowledge of education law.
5. There will be consistency between the perceptions of Minnesota principals, superintendents, and school district attorneys and Montana principals, superintendents, and school district attorneys.

The data were tested via the following null hypotheses:

1. There will be no significant correlation between the perceptions of principals, superintendents, and school district attorneys regarding the areas of education law essential for Minnesota public school principals to know.
2. There will be no significant correlation between the perceptions of principals, superintendents, and school district attorneys regarding the areas of education law that public school principals have the most immediate need for continuing education.

3. There is will be no significant correlation between the perceptions of principals, superintendents, and school district attorneys regarding the topics of education law that are considered critical for inclusion, or to be given priority, in Minnesota principal licensure programs.
4. There will be no significant correlation between the perceptions of principals, superintendents, and school district attorneys regarding the avenues for continuing education considered most convenient and efficient for Minnesota public school principals to attain new knowledge of education law.
5. There will be inconsistency between the perceptions of Minnesota principals, superintendents, and school district attorneys and Montana principals, superintendents, and school district attorneys.

Research Design Strategy

This quantitative study was completed using an exploratory, descriptive survey, which included three parts. Part I, Demographic Information, asked participants for their demographic data including topics such as gender, current position (principal, superintendent, or school district attorney), experience in education and administration, education level, education law coursework, school district enrollment size, and education law workshops.

Part II, Important Areas of Education Law for Principals, asked respondents questions about the importance of education law areas and level of need for additional training in those areas. In addition, respondents were asked which education law areas

are critical for inclusion in education law coursework within principal licensure programs. The six domains include 64 education law areas in which respondents were surveyed. In addition, Part II of the survey collected data specific to addressing the following research questions:

1. Which areas of education law are considered essential for Minnesota public school principals to know?
2. What are the areas of education law that public school principals have the most immediate need for continuing education?
3. Which topics of education law are considered critical for inclusion, or to be given priority, in Minnesota principal licensure programs?

Part III, Continuing Education for Principals, asked respondents several questions with the intention of identifying the most convenient and efficient avenues for Minnesota public school principals to receive continuing education on education law matters. Part III of the survey collected data to address the following research question and sub-questions:

4. What avenues for continuing education are considered most convenient and efficient for Minnesota public school principals to attain new knowledge of education law?
 - a. What settings of education law continuing education opportunities are most convenient and effective for principals?
 - b. What time increments of education law continuing education opportunities are most convenient and effective for principals?

Measures

The focus of this quantitative, exploratory, descriptive study was to determine what education laws are essential for public school principals to know, what education laws are critical for inclusion in Minnesota principal licensure programs, and which avenues are most convenient and efficient for attaining new knowledge about education law. It was accomplished by analyzing the perceptions of Minnesota public school principals, superintendents, and school district attorneys. Similarities and differences of perceptions between respondent categories were identified and analyzed. The study was conducted using an online, cross-sectional survey, which gathered descriptive, quantitative data regarding six domains of education law topics (exceptional children, student rights, teacher/employee issues, tort liabilities, miscellaneous, and academic issues). The data determined which domains are most essential for a Minnesota public school principal to know, which domains are critical for inclusion in Minnesota principal licensure programs, and which avenues are most convenient and efficient for attaining new education law knowledge.

This particular survey is a close variation to the survey designed by Magone (2007), who modeled his, in part, after Zahler (2001) and also from education law subtopics addressed in the following education law textbooks: Cambron-McCabe, McCarthy, and Thomas (2004); Dunklee and Shoop (1992); Alexander and Alexander (2001) (Magone, p.37). In addition, Magone (2007) utilized the following education law topic resources in designing this descriptive survey: Alexander and Alexander (2005); Cambron-McCabe, McCarthy and Thomas (2004); Russo (2006);

and Ricci (1997) (Magone, pp. 37-38).

Sampling Design

In order to complete this study, the survey was sent through email to public school principals, superintendents, and school district attorneys within the state of Minnesota. This was accomplished through a partnership with the Minnesota Association of Secondary School Principals (MASSP), the Minnesota Elementary School Principals Association (MESPA), the Minnesota Department of Education (MDE), and the Minnesota School Boards Association's (MSBA) Council of School Attorneys. Using the databases of these organizations, the survey was distributed to 2,380 public school administrators and school district attorneys across the state of Minnesota – 1,106 members of MASSP, 950 members of MESPA, 324 Minnesota superintendents certified by MDE, and 64 members of MSBA's Council of School Attorneys. Therefore, Minnesota public school principals, superintendents, and school district attorneys were the population (N). The respondents of the survey were the sample (n) of this study.

As previously stated, this quantitative, exploratory, descriptive study extending prior research was conducted via an online descriptive survey sent to Minnesota public school principals, superintendents, and school district attorneys. The purpose for limiting the study to the state of Minnesota was due to differing state education laws (Bain, 2009).

Data Collection Procedures

The exploratory, descriptive survey to be utilized in this study was conducted

entirely over the Internet, specifically using email. Magone (2007), whose original research is extended through this study, utilized the online/web-based program, Select Survey. This study utilized the resources of Qualtrics, which sent and received all surveys online. The data of the respondents was analyzed using Qualtrics and R.

Field Test

The online descriptive survey utilized in this study was field tested in July of 2011. In all, five respondents participated and submitted their data using the survey. All five respondents were licensed and employed teachers in the state of Minnesota, none of whom were in the population of this study when conducted.

Respondents were asked to carefully review the survey and take note of any suspected biased or leading questions, spelling errors, confusing or misleading prompts, and any other issues which may impact their ability to complete the survey or provide effective data.

None of the respondents reported any spelling or grammatical errors, confusing or misleading prompts, or biased or misleading questions. All gave very strong approval of the survey and its design. The only criticism came from one of the respondents who stated it took them more than 30 minutes to complete the survey, which was perceived as far too long. This raised the concern of respondents rushing to complete the survey, or not completing it in its entirety, due to time constraints.

Pilot Test

As previously stated, the survey instrument used by Magone (2007) was developed, in part, from the study conducted by Zahler (2001). It was then expanded

with additional questions by “utilizing school law subject area information from well-recognized graduate level school law textbooks” (p. 39). To establish face validity of the survey instrument, Magone received permission from the University of Montana to conduct pilot tests of three former school principals, three former school superintendents, and two school attorneys. Communications with the pilot survey respondents invited suggestions for adjustments, recommendations, and clarifications.

The pilot test for this study was conducted in May 2013 within Osseo Area Schools ISD 279. The 41 respondents included the superintendent, assistant superintendents, principals, assistant principals, and the school district attorney. Very similar to the field test, the feedback was overwhelmingly positive and supportive. Three respondents left feedback indicating that the survey was longer than expected, but that the study was nonetheless important and timely. No spelling or grammatical errors were reported, nor did any feedback include concerns of biased or misleading questions.

Data Analysis

The quantitative, exploratory, descriptive survey included three sections. Part I of the survey collected data on the respondents’ demographics, Part II collected the respondents’ perceptions of important areas of education law, and Part III collected the respondents’ perceptions of the most effective means of continuing education for public school principals.

The results from Part I were used to provide descriptive data regarding the respondents, specifically their current positions in public education identifying

themselves as principals, superintendents, or school district attorneys. Their identification from Part I was used for comparative analysis regarding their data in Part II, such as comparing the trends of principals to superintendents or the responses from smaller school districts to larger school districts.

The results from Part II were analyzed and compared according to the respondents' position of employment (principals, superintendents, and school district attorneys), and the student enrollment of the school district in which they work. The data were analyzed with the objective of determining by rank the domains and individual areas of education law that received the strongest responses to the survey questions. Through this analysis, it was determined which education law areas are perceived by the respondents as essential for Minnesota public school principals to know; which education law areas that current school principals have the most immediate need for gaining new knowledge; and which education law topics need to be included, or to be given priority, in Minnesota principal licensure programs.

The data collected from Part III was analyzed and compared based upon the respondents' current position in education (principal, assistant principal or superintendent) and school district enrollment size. This identified the settings and time increments that were deemed convenient and efficient by respondents for principals to receive continuing education on relevant education law topics.

The survey was distributed and collected via the services and resources provided by Qualtrics. The data from the respondents were first analyzed by Qualtrics to address the research questions by gathering specific percentages related to each

question. Results were analyzed and compared based upon the following employment position groups: Overall, Superintendents, Principals, Assistant Principals, and Attorneys. In addition, survey results were further analyzed by the school district enrollment size of each employment group. Then, through the use of R, a system for statistical computation and graphics, respondents' data from Parts II and III of the survey were analyzed to determine responses with statistical significance in order to address the null hypotheses. Deemed a "highly effective" program, R allows for astute data analysis with flexibility and tests against data that is potentially misleading (Braun, & Maindonald, 2010). The Two-Way Chi-Square Test was used to identify responses of significant statistical difference. The tests were run on each question of Parts II and III using the following demographic factors: Position of Employment, Highest Earned Educational Degree, District Type, Years Experience in School Administration, and Number of Education Law Courses Taken.

Three numbers factor into the Two-Way Chi-Square Test. First is the Chi-Square Statistic, which measures the difference between the observed and expected. Second is the Degrees of Freedom (df), found by $(r-1)(c-1)$: r being the number of rows and c being the number of columns. And third is the P-value, which denotes statistically significant responses. The higher the P-value, the more significant the responses are in similarity. The lower the P-value (0.03 or below), the more significant the responses are in difference (Chase & Dummer, 1992).

Limitations of Methodology

This quantitative, exploratory, descriptive study included the following

limitations:

1. While Parts II and III offer an opportunity for the respondent to provide additional feedback, the nature of the survey may not allow for direct feedback on each question aside from the immediate options.
2. Data collected from respondents is limited to their perceptions of the research questions.

Ethical Considerations

When the survey was sent to all members of the population (N), an informed consent form was included, thoroughly explaining the purpose and nature of the study and rationale for the research (see Appendix E). Qualtrics rendered all participants anonymous and maintained complete confidentiality of name and location of work by assigning a user code number to each participant. All data collected during the study was accessed by no one other than the researcher and was maintained until the study was complete at which time all data was erased.

Chapter IV

Results

Introduction

This study was designed to identify the areas of education law considered essential for Minnesota public school principals to know. In addition, it sought to ascertain the areas of education law in which public school principals have the most immediate need for continuing education; the topics of education law that are considered critical for inclusion, or to be given priority, in Minnesota principal licensure programs; the avenues for continuing education considered most convenient and efficient for Minnesota public school principals to attain new knowledge of education law; and the differences, if any, in perceptions between Minnesota public school principals, superintendents, and school district attorneys and Montana public school principals, superintendents, and school district attorneys.

This chapter is organized by the following sections: a) Introduction, b) Survey Sample Characteristics and Response Rate, c) Part I Survey Results: Demographic Information, d) Research Question and Hypothesis One, e) Research Question and Hypothesis Two, f) Research Question and Hypothesis Three, g) Research Question and Hypothesis Four, and h) Research Question and Hypothesis Five.

Survey Sample Characteristics and Response Rate

A total of 2,380 Minnesota public school principals and superintendents along

with 64 attorneys were distributed the survey via email in June 2013. The total population (N), therefore, was 2,444. The email distribution involved one formal request for respondent participation followed by two reminders spaced approximately 10 days apart (see Appendix D). A total of 501 responses were submitted, though seven of those contained no data. The total sample (n), therefore, was 494, producing a 20% total response rate. Superintendent participation achieved a 39% response rate (127/344), principal participation achieved a 17% response rate (350/2056), and attorney participation achieved a 26% response rate (17/64). Overall, principals represented 71% of total respondents; superintendents represented 26% of total respondents; and school district attorneys represented 3% of total respondents.

In the 20 years from 1975 to 1995, response rates for studies which used questionnaires as the basis for data collection declined nearly 25%, from 64.4% to 48.4% (Baruch, 1999, as cited in Baruch & Holtom, 2008). Additional studies examined national surveys and also found decreased response rates (Cycyota & Harrison, 2006; Rogelberg & Stanton, 2007; Steeh, 1981; as cited in Baruch & Holtom, 2008). The two primary reasons for low response rates were determined to be lack of success in contacting the target population and the disinclination of people to respond to the survey and/or the request (Baruch & Holtom, 2008). A study which examined reasons for non-response found 28% of the target population indicated they were too busy, 22% stated it was against company policy, 14% did not consider the study relevant, 12% found the address unavailable to return the survey, and 24% did not give clear reasons (Fenton-O’Creevy, 1996, as cited in Baruch & Holtom, 2008).

Participants in both the field test and the pilot test of the Qualtrics survey used in this study indicated that the length of a survey and time it required to complete was a concern. Several emails from members of the population were received during the data collection which indicated they chose not to participate or finish participating due to the length of time it they perceived was needed to participate. Part III of the survey received the fewest responses, further indicating that participants started, but did not finish. Given that the survey contained over 30 questions focusing on six education law domains and 64 individual areas of education law, it can be assumed that members of the population had sizeable concern over the amount of time required to take and complete the survey, resulting in a lower response rate than desired.

Baruch and Holtom (2009) noted, however, that response rates are but one element to take into account in assessing the quality of studies. Furthermore, they stress the importance of the respondents to the study being representative of the population targeted for research. To that end, this study was successful with 71% of total respondents being licensed Minnesota public school principals.

Survey Results – Part I: Demographic Information

Respondents provided data on 13 demographic categories: a) Current employment position, b) gender, c) ethnicity, d) age, e) highest completed educational degree, f) type of school district in which the respondent is employed, g) total school district enrollment, h) years of experience in educational administrative, i) years of experience in education, j) number of education law courses required in principal

licensure program, k) years of attorney experience, l) years of education law experience, and m) current attorney position.

Current Education Employment Position

The vast majority of respondents (350/494, or 71%) were licensed principals. Of the 350 principals, 245 were serving in the position of lead principal and 105 in the position of assistant principal. Licensed superintendents composed 26% (127/494) of the respondents, 124 of which were serving as superintendents and only three who were serving as assistant superintendents. Attorneys composed 3% of the respondents (17/494).

Gender, Ethnicity, and Age

Males composed 67% (333/494) of all respondents in this study. Most notable was that 85% (108/127) of all superintendent participants were males. Attorneys represented the only participant group in which females composed the majority with 71% (12/17). Of all survey participants, 97% (480/494) identified themselves as White. American Indians composed the largest non-White subgroup, with six participants. Survey participants who identified themselves as between the ages of 41-50 composed the largest percentage, with 35% (172/494), followed closely by participants between the ages of 51-60, with 34% (170/494). The largest age range for Superintendents was 51-60, with 40% (51/127), while the largest age range for Principals and Assistant Principals was 41-50, with 36% (87/245) and 45% (47/105), respectively. Attorneys between the ages of 51-60 composed the largest percentage with 41% (7/17).

Highest Completed Educational Degree

The degree of Educational Specialist was identified by 60% (294/494) of all recipients as their highest completed educational degree. This was consistent in all participant groups with the exception of Attorneys, of which 53% (9/17) selected Doctorate.

Type of School District

The majority of respondents, 58% (282/484), identified their school district as rural, including 80% of Superintendents. The majority of Assistant Principals and Attorneys identified their school districts as suburban with 51% (54/105) and 73% (8/11), respectively.

Total Student Enrollment

Respondents were employed in school districts with various sizes of student enrollment. The largest portion of respondents, 32% (154/487), cited employment in school districts with 1,000 students or less. Nearly half of Superintendents, 49% (61/124), and 33% (80/245) of Principals were employed in school districts with 1,000 students or fewer.

Years of Administrative Experience in Education

This category reveals a wider range of responses; the amount of experience most common was between 11-15 years, with 26% (125/483) of respondents. Next was between 6-10 years, with 24% (116/483) of respondents. Among all respondents, Assistant Principals with 1-5 years of administrative experience in education had the highest single percentage, with 33% (34/104).

Years of Experience in Education

The data reveals that 41% (200/488) of respondents had 26 years or more years of experience in education. More Superintendents and Principals listed 26 years or more of experience, with 59% (73/124) and 41% (101/244), respectively. Assistant Principals fared slightly different, with 31% (32/104) listing 16-20 years of experience.

Number of Education Law Courses Required in Principal Licensure Programs

Nearly all respondents, 96% (467/484), stated they were required to take at least one education law course in their principal licensure program. While 56% (272/284) of respondents were required to take one education law course, 30% (145/484) were required to take two, 10% (50/484) were required to take three, and 4% (17/484) were not required to take a single education law course.

The majority of principal licensure programs require one education law course, as 55% (68/124) of Superintendents, 58% (142/245) of Principals, and 57% (60/105) of Assistant Principals all responded in kind.

Years of Attorney Experience

The vast majority of attorney respondents, 77% (17/22), have practiced law for 11 years or more. Only 18% (4/22) have five years of experience or less.

Years of Education Law Experience

Most attorney respondents, 70% (14/20), have 11 years or more of education law experience. Only 10% (2/20) have five years of education law experience or less.

Current Attorney Employment Position

The majority of attorney respondents, 53% (10/19), declared to be employed within a private practice, while 36% responded that they were employed by a public organization or state agency.

Research Question and Hypothesis One

Question One. Which areas of education law are considered essential for Minnesota public school principals to know?

Hypothesis One. There will be a positive correlation between the perceptions of principals, superintendents, and school district attorneys regarding the areas of education law considered essential for Minnesota public school principals to know.

Null Hypothesis One. There will be no significant correlation between the perceptions of principals, superintendents, and school district attorneys regarding the areas of education law essential for Minnesota public school principals to know.

Findings. In Part II of the survey, Important Areas of Education Law, participants were asked to assess 64 different areas of education laws which were grouped into six domains: Student Rights, Teacher and Employment Issues, Miscellaneous, Academic Issues, Exceptional Children, and Tort Liabilities. Participants were asked to indicate the level of importance of each education law area to Minnesota public school principals: Essential, Important, or Not Important.

Responses to the survey questions for the six domains and 64 areas of education law were analyzed by total responses of participants, their individual employment position, and their individual employment position along with their

district enrollment size. The data were analyzed with the objective of determining by rank the most essential areas of education law that Minnesota public school principals should know.

The Two-Way Chi-Square Test was also utilized as means of testing the null hypotheses to identify responses in which significant statistical differences occurred. The six questions in Part II of the survey which addressed the essential education law areas for Minnesota public school principals to know were tested using the following demographic factors: Position of Employment, Highest Earned Educational Degree, District Type, Years Experience in School Administration, and Number of Education Law Courses Taken.

Tables 1 and 2 depict the six domains ranked in order by the frequency of laws within each domain being identified as “Essential”; Table 1 displays the overall results and those by employment position, while Table 2 illustrates the results of Superintendents, Principals, and Assistant Principals by student enrollment size. District enrollment sizes were broken into four ranges: 1,000 or fewer, 1,000–5,000, 5,001–10,000, and more than 10,000. Tables 3 and 4 display the 10 education law areas, out of the 64 total areas, deemed most essential for Minnesota public school principals to know. Rankings occurred by the frequency in which they were indicated as “Essential” by participants. When ties occurred, the tables include additional education law areas.

As Table 1 shows the rankings of the six education law domains by the following groups: Overall, Superintendents, Principals, Assistant Principals, and

Attorneys. The domain of Exceptional Children received the highest ranking by all position groups with an Overall rating of 62%. Student Rights was the domain with the second highest ranking at 47%, and was rated second according to all employment position groups except for Assistant Principals, who rated it third by only a 1% difference. Teacher and Employment Issues received the third highest ranking, with 41%. These three domains were in the top three in all employment position groups, with the exception of Attorneys, who rated Academic Issues and Miscellaneous higher than Teacher and Employment Issues. The domains of Miscellaneous and Tort Liabilities were found to be the lowest ranked.

Table 1

Law Domains Ranked by Current Employment Position Groupings

| OVERALL | |
|---|---|
| Exceptional Children – 62% Student Rights – 47% Teacher and Employment Issues – 41% Academic Issues – 34% Tort Liabilities – 33% Miscellaneous – 32% | |
| SUPERINTENDENTS | PRINCIPALS |
| Exceptional Children – 59% Student Rights – 48% Teacher and Employment Issues – 39% Tort Liabilities – 35% Academic Issues – 34% Miscellaneous – 33% | Exceptional Children – 62% Student Rights – 47% Teacher and Employment Issues – 45% Academic Issues – 34% Tort Liabilities – 33% Miscellaneous – 32% |
| ASSISTANT PRINCIPALS | ATTORNEYS |
| Exceptional Children – 64% Teacher and Employment Issues – 49% Student Rights – 48% Academic Issues – 34% Miscellaneous – 32% Tort Liabilities – 31% | Exceptional Children – 62% Student Rights – 38% Academic Issues – 37% Miscellaneous – 34% Teacher and Employment Issues – 27% Tort Liabilities – 27% |

Table 2 shows the ratings of the six domains by the groups of Superintendents, Principals, and Assistant Principals within the four student enrollment size ranges. In every group, the domain of Exceptional Children was ranked highest. Following Exceptional Children was Student Rights and Teacher and Employment Issues in all employment position and district student enrollment groupings. The only inconsistency was in the grouping of Assistant Principals in districts with enrollment sizes between 5,001 and 10,000, where Teacher and

Employment Issues was ranked second and Student Rights third. The domain of Miscellaneous was rated least essential in nine of the 12 groupings.

Table 2

Law Domains Ranked by District Student Enrollment Size Groupings

| Enrollment: 1,000 or fewer | | |
|--|---|---|
| SUPERINTENDENTS: Exceptional Children – 59% Student Rights – 48% Teacher and Employment Issues – 39% Miscellaneous – 37% Academic Issues – 34% Tort Liabilities – 34% | PRINCIPALS: Exceptional Children – 56% Student Rights – 44% Teacher and Employment Issues – 37% Academic Issues – 31% Tort Liabilities – 31% Miscellaneous – 29% | ASSISTANT PRINCIPALS: Exceptional Children – 76% Student Rights – 46% Teacher and Employment Issues – 45% Academic Issues – 30% Tort Liabilities – 29% Miscellaneous – 26% |
| Enrollment: 1,001 – 5,000 | | |
| SUPERINTENDENTS: Exceptional Children – 61% Student Rights – 48% Teacher and Employment Issues – 40% Academic Issues – 36% Tort Liabilities – 34% Miscellaneous – 31% | PRINCIPALS: Exceptional Children – 63% Student Rights – 47% Teacher and Employment Issues – 40% Academic Issues – 36% Tort Liabilities – 31% Miscellaneous – 29% | ASSISTANT PRINCIPALS: Exceptional Children – 63% Student Rights – 46% Teacher and Employment Issues – 40% Academic Issues – 36% Tort Liabilities – 33% Miscellaneous – 32% |
| Enrollment: 5,001 – 10,000 | | |
| SUPERINTENDENTS: Exceptional Children – 59% Student Rights – 48% Teacher and Employment Issues – 39% Tort Liabilities – 35% Academic Issues – 34% Miscellaneous – 33% | PRINCIPALS: Exceptional Children – 62% Student Rights – 47% Teacher and Employment Issues – 45% Academic Issues – 34% Tort Liabilities – 33% Miscellaneous – 32% | ASSISTANT PRINCIPALS: Exceptional Children – 64% Teacher and Employment Issues – 49% Student Rights – 48% Academic Issues – 34% Miscellaneous – 32% Tort Liabilities – 31% |

Table 2 (continued)

Law Domains Ranked by District Student Enrollment Size Groupings

| Enrollment: more than 10,000 | | |
|--|--|---|
| <p>SUPERINTENDENTS: Exceptional Children – 59% Student Rights – 48% Teacher and Employment Issues – 38% Tort Liabilities – 35% Academic Issues – 34% Miscellaneous – 32%</p> | <p>PRINCIPALS: Exceptional Children – 71% Student Rights – 46% Teacher and Employment Issues – 40% Tort Liabilities – 33% Academic Issues – 31% Miscellaneous – 31%</p> | <p>ASSISTANT PRINCIPALS: Exceptional Children – 57% Student Rights – 50% Teacher and Employment Issues – 45% Miscellaneous – 31% Tort Liabilities – 19% Academic Issues – 17%</p> |

Table 3 displays the highest ranked individual laws based on the following groups: Overall, Superintendents, Principals, Assistant Principals, and Attorneys. There was strong consistency as three of the five groups (Overall, Superintendents, and Principals) deemed the same ten law areas the most essential. The area of Suspensions/Expulsions was ranked highest in all groups except for Attorneys, who ranked Reporting Child Abuse and Due Process for Students or Staff slightly higher. Assistant Principals included Search and Seizure (students) and Student Rights (Exceptional Children) among their highest ranked areas, while Attorneys included Student Rights (Exceptional Children), FERPA/Privacy, Ethics, Parents Rights, and Supervision of Students.

Table 3

Individual Areas Ranked by Current Employment Position Groupings

| OVERALL | |
|---|---|
| Suspensions/Expulsions – 87% Harassment (student) – 83% Staff Evaluation – 81% Dismissal Procedures (staff) – 80% Reporting Child Abuse – 78% Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) – 77% Due Process for Students or Staff – 76% Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act – 75% Disciplining Handicapped Students – 70% Sexual Harassment (staff) – 70% | |
| SUPERINTENDENTS | PRINCIPALS |
| Suspensions/Expulsions – 87% Reporting Child Abuse – 83% Harassment (student) – 81% Staff Evaluation – 81% Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) – 74% Dismissal Procedures (staff) – 74% Due Process for Students or Staff – 74% Sexual Harassment (staff) – 73% Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act – 70% Disciplining Handicapped Students – 70% | Suspensions/Expulsions – 87% Harassment (student) – 85% Dismissal Procedures (staff) – 85% Staff Evaluation – 81% Reporting Child Abuse – 80% Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) – 79% Due Process for Students or Staff – 77% Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act – 76% Disciplining Handicapped Students – 70% Sexual Harassment (staff) – 70% |

Table 3 (continued)

Individual Areas Ranked by Current Employment Position Groupings

| ASSISTANT PRINCIPALS | ATTORNEYS |
|--|--|
| Suspensions/Expulsions – 89% | Reporting Child Abuse – 88% |
| Staff Evaluation – 87% | Due Process for Students or Staff – 88% |
| Harassment (student) – 80% | Suspensions/Expulsions – 82% |
| Dismissal Procedures (staff) – 79% | Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) – 81% |
| Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) – 76% | Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act – 81% |
| Search and Seizure (students) – 76% | Harassment (student) – 76% |
| Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act – 75% | Students Rights (Exceptional Children) – 75% |
| Due Process for Students or Staff – 74% | FERPA/Privacy – 71% |
| Disciplining Handicapped Students – 71% | Disciplining Handicapped Students – 69% |
| Students Rights (Exceptional Children) – 70% | Sexual Harassment (staff) – 63% |
| | Ethics – 63% |
| | Parent Rights – 63% |
| | Supervision of Students – 63% |

Table 4 displays the employment groups of Superintendents, Principals and Assistant Principals by the four student enrollment size ranges.

Suspensions/Expulsions ranked highest or second-highest in all groups except one (Principals in districts with enrollment sizes between 5,000 and 10,000). The areas of Harassment (student), Staff Evaluation, Dismissal Procedures, and Reporting Child Abuse all were ranked among the most essential areas within the groups.

Table 4

Individual Areas Ranked by District Student Enrollment Size Groupings

| Enrollment: 1,000 or fewer | |
|--|--|
| <p>SUPERINTENDENTS: Suspensions/Expulsions – 87% Reporting Child Abuse – 83% Harassment (student) – 81% Staff Evaluation – 81% Dismissal Procedures (staff) – 75% Due Process for Students or Staff – 75% Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) – 74% Sexual Harassment (staff) – 74% Disciplining Handicapped Students – 71% Supervision of Students – 71%</p> | <p>PRINCIPALS: Suspensions/Expulsions – 86% Harassment (student) – 84% Dismissal Procedures (staff) – 82% Reporting Child Abuse – 79% Staff Evaluation – 76% Due Process for Students or Staff – 72% Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) – 71% Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act – 69% Disciplining Handicapped Students – 63% Sexual Harassment (staff) – 63%</p> |
| <p>ASSISTANT PRINCIPALS: Harassment (student) – 91% Suspensions/Expulsions – 91% Parents Rights – 90% Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) – 90% Disciplining Handicapped Students – 90% Due Process for Students or Staff – 90% Search and Seizure (students) – 82% Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act – 80% Students Rights (Exceptional Children) – 80% Reporting Child Abuse – 80%</p> | |

Table 4 (continued)

Individual Areas Ranked by District Student Enrollment Size Groupings

| Enrollment: 1,001 – 5,000 | |
|--|---|
| <p>SUPERINTENDENTS: Suspensions/Expulsions – 88% Staff Evaluation – 84% Harassment (student) – 82% Reporting Child Abuse – 79% Dismissal Procedures (staff) – 79% Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) – 77% Due Process for Students or Staff – 75% Disciplining Handicapped Students – 74% Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act – 72% Sexual Harassment (staff) – 71%</p> | <p>PRINCIPALS: Suspensions/Expulsions – 88% Dismissal Procedures (staff) – 85% Staff Evaluation – 85% Harassment (student) – 83% Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) – 81% Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act – 78% Due Process for Students or Staff – 76% Reporting Child Abuse – 74% Search and Seizure – 71% Disciplining Handicapped Students – 70%</p> |
| <p>ASSISTANT PRINCIPALS: Staff Evaluation – 88% Suspensions/Expulsions – 87% Harassment (student) – 81% Dismissal Procedures (staff) – 79% Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) – 77% Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act – 76% Search and Seizure (students) – 74% Due Process for Students or Staff – 72% Disciplining Handicapped Students – 72% Reporting Child Abuse – 70%</p> | |

Table 4 (continued)

Individual Areas Ranked by District Student Enrollment Size Groupings

| Enrollment: 5,001 – 10,000 | |
|---|---|
| <p>SUPERINTENDENTS: Suspensions/Expulsions – 87% Reporting Child Abuse – 84% Staff Evaluation – 82% Harassment (student) – 81% Dismissal Procedures (staff) – 75% Due Process for Students or Staff – 75% Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) – 74% Sexual Harassment (staff) – 74% Disciplining Handicapped Students – 72% Supervision of Students – 72%</p> | <p>PRINCIPALS: Harassment (student) – 92% Due Process for Students or Staff – 88% Suspensions/Expulsions – 85% Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) – 83% Reporting Child Abuse – 83% Disciplining Handicapped Students – 83% Staff Evaluation – 81% Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act – 79% Parents Rights (Exceptional Children) – 79% Supervision of Students – 78%</p> |
| <p>ASSISTANT PRINCIPALS: Staff Evaluation – 100% Suspensions/Expulsions – 92% Dismissal Procedures (staff) – 92% Harassment (student) – 85% FERPA/Privacy – 69% Search and Seizure (students) – 69% School Finance – 69% Due Process for Students or Staff – 69% Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) – 67% Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act – 67% Disciplining Handicapped Students – 67% Students Rights (Exceptional Children) – 67%</p> | |

Table 4 (continued)

Individual Areas Ranked by District Student Enrollment Size Groupings

| Enrollment: more than 10,000 | |
|---|---|
| <p>SUPERINTENDENTS: Suspensions/Expulsions – 87% Reporting Child Abuse – 84% Staff Evaluation – 82% Harassment (student) – 81% Dismissal Procedures (staff) – 76% Due Process for Students or Staff – 76% Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) – 74% Sexual Harassment (staff) – 74% Disciplining Handicapped Students – 72% Supervision of Students – 72%</p> | <p>PRINCIPALS: Suspensions/Expulsions – 95% Harassment (student) – 88% Dismissal Procedures (staff) – 88% Reporting Child Abuse – 86% Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act – 84% Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) – 81% Sexual Harassment (staff) – 80% Staff Evaluation – 80% Due Process for Students or Staff – 78% Disciplining Handicapped Students – 76% Supervision of Students – 76%</p> |
| <p>ASSISTANT PRINCIPALS: Harassment (student) – 92% Suspensions/Expulsions – 92% Disciplining Handicapped Students – 86% Dismissal Procedures (staff) – 80% Students Rights (Exceptional Children) – 78% Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act – 77% Search and Seizure (students) – 76% Staff Evaluation – 75% Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) – 74% Due Process for Students or Staff – 74%</p> | |

To test the first null hypothesis, the Two-Way Chi-Square Test was utilized to identify responses in which statistically significant differences occurred between respondents' perceptions of education law areas considered essential for Minnesota public school principals to know. Responses deemed statistically significant have a p-value of .03 or lower. The test was run using the following five demographic factors: Position of Employment, Highest Earned Educational Degree, District Type, Years

Experience in School Administration, and Number of Education Law Courses Taken.

Domain I included 10 individual law areas, creating 50 possibilities of statistically significant responses. Table 5 displays the only two responses (4%) within Domain I, Student Rights, which were found to have statistically significant differences: Freedom of Speech by District Type, and Corporal Punishment by Years Experience in School Administration.

Table 5

Freedom of Speech by District Type

| District Type | Essential | Important | Not Important |
|----------------------|------------|------------|---------------|
| Rural | 44% | 53% | 3% |
| Suburban | 56% | 40% | 4% |
| Urban | 29% | 71% | 0% |
| Chi-Square Statistic | df | p value | |
| 12.6 | 4 | 0.01 | |

Corporal Punishment by Years Experience in School Administration

| Experience | Essential | Important | Not Important |
|----------------------|------------|-----------|---------------|
| 1-5 years | 24% | 46% | 29% |
| 6-10 years | 33% | 36% | 31% |
| 11-15 years | 31% | 43% | 26% |
| 16-20 years | 37% | 49% | 14% |
| 21-25 years | 56% | 38% | 7% |
| 26 or more | 40% | 39% | 20% |
| Chi-Square Statistic | df | p value | |
| 22.8 | 10 | 0.01 | |

Domain II, Teacher and Employment Issues, included 11 individual law areas, creating 55 possibilities of statistically significant responses. Table 6 displays the eight responses (15%) that were found to have statistically significant differences: Role of Police Liaison Officer by Position of Employment, Employment Contracts by Position of Employment, Collective Bargaining by Position of Employment,

Education Malpractice by Highest Completed Educational Degree, Equal
 Employment Opportunity by District Type, Role of Police Liaison Officer by District
 Type, Sexual Harassment (student) by Years Experience in School Administration,
 and Role of Police Liaison Officer by Number of Education Law Courses Taken.

Table 6

Role of Police Liaison Officer by Position of Employment

| Position | | Essential | Important | Not Important |
|----------------------|----|------------|-----------|---------------|
| Superintendent | | 18% | 67% | 15% |
| Principal | | 15% | 72% | 12% |
| Assistant Principal | | 30% | 67% | 3% |
| Chi-Square Statistic | df | p value | | |
| 16.6 | 4 | 0.00 | | |

Employment Contracts by Position of Employment

| Position | | Essential | Important | Not Important |
|----------------------|----|------------|------------|---------------|
| Superintendent | | 27% | 62% | 11% |
| Principal | | 25% | 64% | 11% |
| Assistant Principal | | 42% | 52% | 6% |
| Chi-Square Statistic | df | p value | | |
| 11.24 | 4 | 0.02 | | |

Collective Bargaining by Position of Employment

| Position | | Essential | Important | Not Important |
|----------------------|----|------------|------------|---------------|
| Superintendent | | 16% | 55% | 29% |
| Principal | | 18% | 63% | 19% |
| Assistant Principal | | 27% | 63% | 10% |
| Chi-Square Statistic | df | p value | | |
| 14.67 | 4 | 0.01 | | |

Table 6 (continued)

Education Malpractice by Highest Completed Educational Degree

| Position | Essential | Important | Not Important |
|------------------------|------------|-----------|---------------|
| Doctorate | 34% | 51% | 14% |
| Educational Specialist | 34% | 61% | 5% |
| Masters | 40% | 52% | 7% |
| Other | 17% | 67% | 17% |
| Chi-Square Statistic | df | p value | |
| 14.67 | 4 | 0.01 | |

Equal Employment Opportunity by District Type

| District Type | Essential | Important | Not Important |
|----------------------|------------|------------|---------------|
| Rural | 23% | 70% | 7% |
| Suburban | 37% | 57% | 6% |
| Urban | 47% | 53% | 0% |
| Chi-Square Statistic | df | p value | |
| 15.02 | 4 | 0.00 | |

Role of Police Liaison Officer by District Type

| District Type | Essential | Important | Not Important |
|----------------------|------------|------------|---------------|
| Rural | 15% | 69% | 15% |
| Suburban | 26% | 69% | 5% |
| Urban | 20% | 77% | 3% |
| Chi-Square Statistic | df | p value | |
| 19.22 | 4 | 0.00 | |

Sexual Harassment (student) by Years Experience in School Administration

| Experience | Essential | Important | Not Important |
|----------------------|------------|------------|---------------|
| 1-5 years | 58% | 42% | 0% |
| 6-10 years | 69% | 31% | 0% |
| 11-15 years | 72% | 28% | 0% |
| 16-20 years | 74% | 25% | 2% |
| 21-25 years | 72% | 28% | 0% |
| 26 or more | 91% | 9% | 0% |
| Chi-Square Statistic | df | p value | |
| 21.91 | 10 | 0.02 | |

Table 6 (continued)

Role of Police Liaison Officer by Number of Education Law Courses Taken

| Courses Taken | | Essential | Important | Not Important |
|----------------------|----|-----------|-----------|---------------|
| 1 | | 17% | 67% | 16% |
| 2 | | 23% | 74% | 4% |
| 3 or more | | 20% | 76% | 4% |
| Chi-Square Statistic | df | p value | | |
| 16.36 | 4 | 0.00 | | |

Domain III, Miscellaneous, included 19 individual law areas, creating 95 possibilities of statistically significant responses. Table 7 displays the 12 responses (13%) that were found to have statistically significant differences: Section 1983 (Federal Tort–Constitutional Rights) Actions by Position of Employment, School Fees by Position of Employment, Academic Sanctions for Students by Position of Employment, Reporting Child Abuse by Position of Employment, Public Access to School Facilities by Position of Employment, Open Meeting/Public Records Law by Position of Employment, School Finance by District Type, Desegregation by District Type, Section 1983 (Federal Tort-Constitutional Rights) Actions by Years Experience in School Administration, Academic Sanctions for Students by Years Experience in School Administration, Public Access to School Facilities by Years Experience in School Administration, and Legal Research/Case Study Skills by Number of Education Law Courses Taken.

Table 7

Section 1983 (Federal Tort–Constitutional Rights) Actions by Position of Employment

| Position | Essential | Important | Not Important |
|----------------------|------------|-----------|---------------|
| Superintendent | 10% | 63% | 26% |
| Principal | 25% | 65% | 11% |
| Assistant Principal | 17% | 61% | 21% |
| Chi-Square Statistic | df | p value | |
| 12.26 | 4 | 0.02 | |

School Fees by Position of Employment

| Position | Essential | Important | Not Important |
|----------------------|------------|------------|---------------|
| Superintendent | 24% | 51% | 25% |
| Principal | 11% | 71% | 18% |
| Assistant Principal | 8% | 71% | 21% |
| Chi-Square Statistic | df | p value | |
| 20.94 | 4 | 0.00 | |

Academic Sanctions for Students by Position of Employment

| Position | Essential | Important | Not Important |
|----------------------|------------|-----------|---------------|
| Superintendent | 40% | 57% | 4% |
| Principal | 23% | 67% | 9% |
| Assistant Principal | 28% | 63% | 9% |
| Chi-Square Statistic | df | p value | |
| 10.75 | 4 | 0.03 | |

Reporting Child Abuse by Position of Employment

| Position | Essential | Important | Not Important |
|----------------------|------------|------------|---------------|
| Superintendent | 84% | 16% | 0% |
| Principal | 68% | 28% | 4% |
| Assistant Principal | 80% | 19% | 1% |
| Chi-Square Statistic | df | p value | |
| 12.45 | 4 | 0.01 | |

Table 7 (continued)

Public Access to School Facilities by Position of Employment

| Position | Essential | Important | Not Important |
|----------------------|------------|------------|---------------|
| Superintendent | 25% | 69% | 7% |
| Principal | 18% | 71% | 11% |
| Assistant Principal | 26% | 56% | 18% |
| Chi-Square Statistic | df | p value | |
| 10.48 | 4 | 0.03 | |

Open Meeting/Public Records Law by Position of Employment

| Position | Essential | Important | Not Important |
|----------------------|------------|------------|---------------|
| Superintendent | 36% | 46% | 18% |
| Principal | 25% | 65% | 11% |
| Assistant Principal | 22% | 64% | 14% |
| Chi-Square Statistic | df | p value | |
| 11.63 | 4 | 0.02 | |

School Finance by District Type

| District Type | Essential | Important | Not Important |
|----------------------|------------|------------|---------------|
| Rural | 28% | 66% | 6% |
| Suburban | 41% | 53% | 5% |
| Urban | 69% | 28% | 3% |
| Chi-Square Statistic | df | p value | |
| 22.73 | 4 | 0.00 | |

Desegregation by District Type

| District Type | Essential | Important | Not Important |
|----------------------|------------|------------|---------------|
| Rural | 8% | 71% | 21% |
| Suburban | 19% | 71% | 10% |
| Urban | 38% | 55% | 7% |
| Chi-Square Statistic | df | p value | |
| 31.86 | 4 | 0.00 | |

Table 7 (continued)

Section 1983 (Federal Tort-Constitutional Rights) Actions by Years Experience in School Administration

| Experience | Essential | Important | Not Important |
|----------------------|-----------|------------|---------------|
| 1-5 years | 18% | 74% | 8% |
| 6-10 years | 13% | 72% | 16% |
| 11-15 years | 19% | 55% | 26% |
| 16-20 years | 20% | 44% | 36% |
| 21-25 years | 17% | 63% | 20% |
| 26 or more | 18% | 62% | 21% |
| Chi-Square Statistic | df | p value | |
| 23.83 | 10 | 0.01 | |

Academic Sanctions for Students by Years Experience in School Administration

| Experience | Essential | Important | Not Important |
|----------------------|------------|-----------|---------------|
| 1-5 years | 24% | 69% | 7% |
| 6-10 years | 21% | 72% | 8% |
| 11-15 years | 31% | 60% | 9% |
| 16-20 years | 25% | 56% | 19% |
| 21-25 years | 44% | 54% | 2% |
| 26 or more | 40% | 60% | 0% |
| Chi-Square Statistic | df | p value | |
| 24.48 | 10 | 0.01 | |

Public Access to School Facilities by Years Experience in School Administration

| Experience | Essential | Important | Not Important |
|----------------------|------------|------------|---------------|
| 1-5 years | 18% | 68% | 14% |
| 6-10 years | 25% | 62% | 14% |
| 11-15 years | 18% | 67% | 15% |
| 16-20 years | 19% | 66% | 15% |
| 21-25 years | 41% | 59% | 0% |
| 26 or more | 18% | 80% | 2% |
| Chi-Square Statistic | df | p value | |
| 21.31 | 10 | 0.02 | |

Table 7 (continued)

Legal Research/Case Study Skills by Number of Education Law Courses Taken

| Courses Taken | Essential | Important | Not Important |
|----------------------|------------|-----------|---------------|
| 1 | 16% | 51% | 33% |
| 2 | 23% | 57% | 20% |
| 3 or more | 19% | 65% | 16% |
| Chi-Square Statistic | df | p value | |
| 10.91 | 4 | 0.03 | |

Domain IV, Academic Issues, included eight individual law areas, creating 40 possibilities of statistically significant responses. Table 8 displays the one response (3%) that was found to have statistically significant difference: Compulsory Attendance by District Type.

Table 8

Compulsory Attendance by District Type

| District Type | Essential | Important | Not Important |
|----------------------|------------|------------|---------------|
| Rural | 47% | 47% | 6% |
| Suburban | 36% | 62% | 2% |
| Urban | 38% | 62% | 0% |
| Chi-Square Statistic | df | p value | |
| 12.24 | 4 | 0.02 | |

Domain V, Exceptional Children, included seven individual law areas, creating 35 possibilities of statistically significant responses. Table 9 displays the one response (3%) that was found to have statistically significant difference: Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act by the Number of Education Law Courses Taken

Table 9

Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act by the Number of Education Law Courses Taken

| Courses Taken | | Essential | Important | Not Important |
|----------------------|----|------------|------------|---------------|
| 1 | | 73% | 27% | 0% |
| 2 | | 80% | 20% | 0% |
| 3 or more | | 67% | 31% | 2% |
| Chi-Square Statistic | df | p value | | |
| 11.58 | 4 | 0.02 | | |

Domain VI, Tort Liabilities, included nine individual law areas, creating 45 possibilities of statistically significant responses. Table 10 displays the three responses (7%) that were found to have statistically significant differences: Student Transportation by District Type, Supervision of Students by Years in Educational Administration, and Intentional Torts by Years in Educational Administration.

Table 10

Student Transportation by District Type

| District Type | | Essential | Important | Not Important |
|----------------------|----|------------|------------|---------------|
| Rural | | 28% | 65% | 8% |
| Suburban | | 13% | 76% | 11% |
| Urban | | 29% | 68% | 4% |
| Chi-Square Statistic | df | p value | | |
| 13.33 | 4 | 0.01 | | |

Supervision of Students by Years in Educational Administration

| Experience | Essential | Important | Not Important |
|----------------------|------------|-----------|---------------|
| 1-5 years | 55% | 44% | 2% |
| 6-10 years | 60% | 37% | 3% |
| 11-15 years | 65% | 35% | 0% |
| 16-20 years | 70% | 29% | 2% |
| 21-25 years | 76% | 24% | 0% |
| 26 or more | 90% | 8% | 2% |
| Chi-Square Statistic | df | p value | |
| 21.95 | 10 | 0.02 | |

Table 10 (continued)

Intentional Torts by Years in Educational Administration

| Experience | Essential | Important | Not Important |
|----------------------|------------|------------|---------------|
| 1-5 years | 35% | 64% | 2% |
| 6-10 years | 36% | 63% | 1% |
| 11-15 years | 31% | 61% | 7% |
| 16-20 years | 32% | 57% | 11% |
| 21-25 years | 49% | 46% | 5% |
| 26 or more | 49% | 38% | 13% |
| Chi-Square Statistic | df | p value | |
| 20.95 | 10 | 0.02 | |

Discussion. Of the six education law domains, Exceptional Children, Student Rights, and Teacher and Employment Issues were found to be considered most essential for Minnesota public school principals to know. And of the 64 individual education law areas, Suspensions/Expulsions, Harassment (student), Staff Evaluation, Dismissal Procedures (staff), and Reporting Child Abuse were found to be considered most essential for Minnesota public school principals to know.

Within the six education law domains, responses to the 64 individual areas of education law were analyzed based upon five demographic factors: Position of Employment, Highest Earned Educational Degree, District Type, Years Experience in School Administration, and Number of Education Law Courses Taken. This created 320 responses in which statistically significant differences could have been identified regarding essential areas of education law for principals to know. Of the 320 total responses, only 27 (8%) were identified through analysis to have statistically significant differences. This provides sufficient evidence to reject the null hypothesis.

Research Question and Hypothesis Two

Question Two. What are the areas of education law that public school principals have the most immediate need for continuing education?

Hypothesis Two. There will be a positive correlation between the perceptions of principals, superintendents, and school district attorneys regarding the areas of education law that public school principals have the most immediate need for continuing education.

Null Hypothesis Two. There will be no significant correlation between the perceptions of principals, superintendents, and school district attorneys regarding the areas of education law that public school principals have the most immediate need for continuing education.

Findings. In Part II of the survey, participants were also asked to indicate regarding 64 different areas of education laws within the six domains whether the area of education law knowledge is of immediate need for new knowledge. Again, participant responses to the survey questions for the six domains and 64 areas of education law were analyzed by total responses of participants, their individual employment position, and their individual employment position along with their district enrollment size. The data were analyzed with the objective of determining by rank the areas of education law that have the most immediate need for continuing education.

The Two-Way Chi-Square Test was again utilized as means of testing the null hypotheses to identify responses in which significant statistical differences occurred.

The six questions in Part II of the survey which addressed the areas of education law in which principals have the most immediate need for continuing education were tested using the following demographic factors: Position of Employment, Highest Earned Educational Degree, District Type, Years Experience in School Administration, and Number of Education Law Courses Taken.

Survey participants were also asked in Part II of the survey, Important Areas of Education Law, to identify whether an immediate need exists among any of the 64 areas of education law for continuing education in that particular area. “Immediate” was defined as needing continuing education within the next 12 months. The results were analyzed to determine the rank of the six education law domains by employment group as well as the 10 individual law areas by employment group deemed most in need of immediate continuing education.

Table 11 depicts the six domains ranked in order by the frequency of laws within each domain being identified by respondents as needing immediate continuing education. Overall results are displayed in Table 11 as well as those by employment position. The domain of Exceptional Children ranked first in all employment position groups with the exception of Superintendents, who ranked Student Rights higher by 3%. Student Rights was ranked second by the Overall group and by Principals, while Teacher and Employment Issues was ranked third overall and second by Assistant Principals and Attorneys. Tort Liabilities was ranked last in all employment position groups with the exception of Attorneys, who ranked Miscellaneous last.

Table 11

Law Domains Ranked by Current Employment Position Groupings

| OVERALL | |
|---|---|
| Exceptional Children – 48% Student Rights – 45% Teacher and Employment Issues – 44% Academic Issues – 40% Miscellaneous – 37% Tort Liabilities – 35% | |
| SUPERINTENDENTS | PRINCIPALS |
| Student Rights – 51% Exceptional Children – 48% Teacher and Employment Issues – 47% Academic Issues – 44% Miscellaneous – 42% Tort Liabilities – 37% | Exceptional Children – 45% Student Rights – 43% Teacher and Employment Issues – 42% Academic Issues – 37% Miscellaneous – 37% Tort Liabilities – 34% |
| ASSISTANT PRINCIPALS | ATTORNEYS |
| Exceptional Children – 50% Teacher and Employment Issues – 43% Student Rights – 42% Academic Issues – 41% Miscellaneous – 36% Tort Liabilities – 33% | Exceptional Children – 64% Teacher and Employment Issues – 56% Student Rights – 52% Tort Liabilities – 45% Academic Issues – 44% Miscellaneous – 42% |

Table 12 shows the highest ranked individual laws deemed to be most in need of immediate continuing education based on the following groups: Overall, Superintendents, Principals, Assistant Principals, and Attorneys. In all employment groups except Attorneys, Staff Evaluation ranked highest. Coming in second in all employment groups with the exception of Assistant Principals was Harassment (student). Dismissal Procedures (staff) and Suspensions/Expulsions each received the third highest ranking overall.

Table 12

Individual Areas Ranked by Current Employment Position Groupings

| OVERALL | |
|--|---|
| Staff Evaluation – 68% Harassment (student) – 64% Dismissal Procedures (staff) – 58% Suspensions/Expulsions – 58% Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) – 57% Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act – 55% Student Testing/NCLB – 54% Reporting Child Abuse – 54% Due Process for Students or Staff – 53% Internet/Computer Usage – 52% | |
| SUPERINTENDENTS | PRINCIPALS |
| Staff Evaluation – 74% Harassment (student) – 68% Suspensions/Expulsions – 63% Internet/Computer Usage – 61% Dismissal Procedures (staff) – 59% Reporting Child Abuse – 58% Search and Seizure – 58% Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) – 57% Curriculum Accountability – 56% FERPA/Privacy – 54% | Staff Evaluation – 66% Harassment (student) – 64% Dismissal Procedures (staff) – 58% Suspensions/Expulsions – 55% Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) – 54% Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act – 53% Sexual Harassment (staff) – 52% Student Testing/NCLB – 51% Due Process for Students or Staff – 51% Reporting Child Abuse – 51% |
| ASSISTANT PRINCIPALS | ATTORNEYS |
| Staff Evaluation – 64% Student Testing/NCLB – 61% Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act – 61% Harassment (student) – 59% Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) – 59% Suspensions/Expulsions – 58% Dismissal Procedures (staff) – 57% Due Process for Students or Staff – 57% Search and Seizure – 54% Internet/Computer Usage – 53% | FERPA/Privacy – 88% Sexual Harassment (staff) – 79% Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act – 79% Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) – 79% Disciplining Handicapped Students – 79% Reporting Child Abuse – 77% Constitutional Rights (staff) – 77% Staff Evaluation – 73% Harassment (student) – 71% Due Process for Students or Staff – 69% |

To test the second null hypothesis, the Two-Way Chi-Square Test was again utilized to identify responses in which statistically significant differences occurred between respondents' perceptions of education law areas in which an immediate need exists for continuing education. In addition, responses to test the third null hypothesis regarding the areas of education law considered critical for inclusion, or to be given priority, in Minnesota principal licensure programs, are included.

Responses deemed statistically significant have a p-value of .03 or lower. The test was again run using the following five demographic factors: Position of Employment, Highest Earned Educational Degree, District Type, Years Experience in School Administration, and Number of Education Law Courses Taken.

Domain I included 10 individual law areas, creating 50 possibilities of statistically significant responses. Table 13 displays the five responses (10%) within Domain I, Student Rights, that were found to have statistically significant differences: Dress Codes by Highest Completed Educational Degree, Search and Seizure by Years Experience in School Administration, Corporal Punishment by Years Experience in School Administration, Dress Codes by Years Experience in School Administration, and Corporal Punishment by Number of Education Law Courses Taken.

Table 13

Dress Codes by Highest Completed Educational Degree

| Degree | Immediately Needed | Critical for Inclusion | Both | Neither |
|------------------------|--------------------|------------------------|------------|------------|
| Doctorate | 17% | 49% | 17% | 18% |
| Educational Specialist | 22% | 52% | 7% | 20% |
| Masters | 21% | 52% | 9% | 18% |
| Other | 15% | 31% | 8% | 46% |
| Chi-Square Statistic | df | p value | | |
| 18.93 | 9 | 0.03 | | |

Search and Seizure by Years Experience in School Administration

| Experience | Immediately Needed | Critical for Inclusion | Both | Neither |
|----------------------|--------------------|------------------------|------------|------------|
| 1-5 years | 35% | 23% | 42% | 0% |
| 6-10 years | 55% | 16% | 25% | 4% |
| 11-15 years | 49% | 20% | 27% | 4% |
| 16-20 years | 52% | 12% | 24% | 12% |
| 21-25 years | 47% | 23% | 30% | 0% |
| 26 or more | 40% | 20% | 36% | 4% |
| Chi-Square Statistic | df | p value | | |
| 29.82 | 15 | 0.01 | | |

Corporal Punishment by Years Experience in School Administration

| Experience | Immediately Needed | Critical for Inclusion | Both | Neither |
|----------------------|--------------------|------------------------|------------|------------|
| 1-5 years | 9% | 56% | 12% | 23% |
| 6-10 years | 9% | 66% | 6% | 19% |
| 11-15 years | 14% | 58% | 13% | 15% |
| 16-20 years | 14% | 55% | 5% | 27% |
| 21-25 years | 30% | 44% | 14% | 12% |
| 26 or more | 11% | 53% | 20% | 16% |
| Chi-Square Statistic | df | p value | | |
| 30.10 | 15 | 0.01 | | |

Table 13 (continued)

Dress Codes by Years Experience in School Administration

| Experience | Immediately Needed | Critical for Inclusion | Both | Neither |
|----------------------|--------------------|------------------------|------------|------------|
| 1-5 years | 15% | 53% | 9% | 23% |
| 6-10 years | 21% | 55% | 7% | 17% |
| 11-15 years | 18% | 58% | 6% | 18% |
| 16-20 years | 24% | 39% | 5% | 32% |
| 21-25 years | 30% | 35% | 19% | 16% |
| 26 or more | 18% | 47% | 20% | 16% |
| Chi-Square Statistic | df | p value | | |
| 29.30 | 15 | 0.01 | | |

Corporal Punishment by Number of Education Law Courses Taken

| Number of Courses | Immediately Needed | Critical for Inclusion | Both | Neither |
|----------------------|--------------------|------------------------|------------|------------|
| 1 | 11% | 74% | 14% | 26% |
| 2 | 16% | 67% | 17% | 10% |
| 3 or more | 10% | 64% | 26% | 24% |
| Chi-Square Statistic | df | p value | | |
| 17.99 | 6 | 0.01 | | |

Domain II included 11 individual law areas, creating 55 possibilities of statistically significant responses. Table 14 displays the seven responses (13%) within Domain II, Teacher and Employment Issues, that were found to have statistically significant differences: Equal Employment Opportunity by District Type, Leave Issues by District Type, Staff Evaluation by District Type, Collective Bargaining by District Type, Sexual Harassment (student) by Years Experience in School Administration, Staff Evaluation by Years Experience in School Administration, and Privacy or Other Constitutional Rights by Number of Education Law Courses Taken.

Table 14

Equal Employment Opportunity by District Type

| District Type | Immediately Needed | Critical for Inclusion | Both | Neither |
|----------------------|--------------------|------------------------|-----------|------------|
| Rural | 18% | 50% | 10% | 22% |
| Suburban | 16% | 58% | 10% | 16% |
| Urban | 48% | 32% | 6% | 13% |
| Chi-Square Statistic | df | p value | | |
| 21.02 | 6 | 0.00 | | |

Leave Issues by District Type

| District Type | Immediately Needed | Critical for Inclusion | Both | Neither |
|----------------------|--------------------|------------------------|------|------------|
| Rural | 23% | 47% | 10% | 19% |
| Suburban | 17% | 52% | 6% | 25% |
| Urban | 42% | 45% | 3% | 10% |
| Chi-Square Statistic | df | p value | | |
| 15.14 | 6 | 0.02 | | |

Staff Evaluation by District Type

| District Type | Immediately Needed | Critical for Inclusion | Both | Neither |
|----------------------|--------------------|------------------------|------------|---------|
| Rural | 21% | 32% | 43% | 4% |
| Suburban | 34% | 26% | 34% | 6% |
| Urban | 26% | 45% | 23% | 6% |
| Chi-Square Statistic | df | p value | | |
| 14.79 | 6 | 0.02 | | |

Collective Bargaining by District Type

| District Type | Immediately Needed | Critical for Inclusion | Both | Neither |
|----------------------|--------------------|------------------------|------|------------|
| Rural | 24% | 40% | 9% | 27% |
| Suburban | 12% | 55% | 7% | 25% |
| Urban | 19% | 58% | 3% | 19% |
| Chi-Square Statistic | df | p value | | |
| 13.65 | 6 | 0.03 | | |

Table 14 (continued)

Sexual Harassment (student) by Years Experience in School Administration

| Experience | Immediately Needed | Critical for Inclusion | Both | Neither |
|----------------------|--------------------|------------------------|------------|------------|
| 1-5 years | 14% | 53% | 26% | 8% |
| 6-10 years | 24% | 41% | 28% | 8% |
| 11-15 years | 15% | 42% | 24% | 18% |
| 16-20 years | 26% | 35% | 37% | 2% |
| 21-25 years | 29% | 29% | 38% | 4% |
| 26 or more | 21% | 52% | 21% | 7% |
| Chi-Square Statistic | df | p value | | |
| 30.10 | 15 | 0.01 | | |

Staff Evaluation by Years Experience in School Administration

| Experience | Immediately Needed | Critical for Inclusion | Both | Neither |
|----------------------|--------------------|------------------------|------------|------------|
| 1-5 years | 22% | 31% | 44% | 4% |
| 6-10 years | 23% | 31% | 40% | 6% |
| 11-15 years | 23% | 24% | 36% | 17% |
| 16-20 years | 30% | 28% | 42% | 0% |
| 21-25 years | 33% | 22% | 42% | 2% |
| 26 or more | 29% | 36% | 32% | 3% |
| Chi-Square Statistic | df | p value | | |
| 28.57 | 15 | 0.02 | | |

Privacy or Other Constitutional Rights by Number of Education Law Courses Taken

| Number of Courses | Immediately Needed | Critical for Inclusion | Both | Neither |
|----------------------|--------------------|------------------------|------------|------------|
| 1 | 13% | 55% | 13% | 20% |
| 2 | 18% | 57% | 14% | 11% |
| 3 or more | 27% | 38% | 21% | 15% |
| Chi-Square Statistic | df | p value | | |
| 14.50 | 6 | 0.02 | | |

Domain III included 19 individual law areas, creating 95 possibilities of statistically significant responses. Table 15 displays the eight responses (8%) within Domain III, Miscellaneous, that were found to have statistically significant differences: Public Access to School Facilities by Highest Completed Educational Degree, Residency Requirements by District Type, Historical/Foundational Legal

Knowledge of Schools by Number of Education Law Courses Taken, Legal Research/Case Study Skills by Number of Education Law Courses Taken, Church and State by Number of Education Law Courses Taken, Residency Requirements by Number of Education Law Courses Taken, School Fees by Number of Education Law Courses Taken, and Open Meeting/Public Records Law by Number of Education Law Courses Taken.

Table 15

Public Access to School Facilities by Highest Completed Educational Degree

| Degree | Immediately Needed | Critical for Inclusion | Both | Neither |
|------------------------|--------------------|------------------------|------------|---------|
| Doctorate | 14% | 53% | 12% | 22% |
| Educational Specialist | 18% | 44% | 5% | 34% |
| Masters | 13% | 61% | 5% | 21% |
| Other | 15% | 54% | 0% | 31% |
| Chi-Square Statistic | df | p value | | |
| 18.03 | 9 | 0.03 | | |

Residency Requirements by District Type

| District Type | Immediately Needed | Critical for Inclusion | Both | Neither |
|----------------------|--------------------|------------------------|------|------------|
| Rural | 20% | 39% | 7% | 33% |
| Suburban | 12% | 50% | 2% | 36% |
| Urban | 16% | 55% | 3% | 26% |
| Chi-Square Statistic | df | p value | | |
| 13.79 | 6 | 0.03 | | |

Historical/Foundational Legal Knowledge of Schools by Number of Education Law Courses Taken

| Number of Courses | Immediately Needed | Critical for Inclusion | Both | Neither |
|----------------------|--------------------|------------------------|------|------------|
| 1 | 11% | 53% | 2% | 34% |
| 2 | 16% | 51% | 6% | 27% |
| 3 or more | 25% | 35% | 4% | 35% |
| Chi-Square Statistic | df | p value | | |
| 13.80 | 6 | 0.03 | | |

Table 15 (continued)

Legal Research/Case Study Skills by Number of Education Law Courses Taken

| Number of Courses | Immediately Needed | Critical for Inclusion | Both | Neither |
|----------------------|--------------------|------------------------|-----------|------------|
| 1 | 13% | 48% | 4% | 36% |
| 2 | 16% | 49% | 13% | 22% |
| 3 or more | 25% | 38% | 10% | 27% |
| Chi-Square Statistic | df | p value | | |
| 21.57 | 6 | 0.00 | | |

Church and State by Number of Education Law Courses Taken

| Number of Courses | Immediately Needed | Critical for Inclusion | Both | Neither |
|----------------------|--------------------|------------------------|-----------|------------|
| 1 | 11% | 57% | 4% | 28% |
| 2 | 17% | 58% | 9% | 17% |
| 3 or more | 21% | 46% | 2% | 31% |
| Chi-Square Statistic | df | p value | | |
| 14.31 | 6 | 0.03 | | |

Residency Requirements by Number of Education Law Courses Taken

| Number of Courses | Immediately Needed | Critical for Inclusion | Both | Neither |
|----------------------|--------------------|------------------------|------|------------|
| 1 | 14% | 46% | 3% | 38% |
| 2 | 21% | 43% | 9% | 28% |
| 3 or more | 25% | 42% | 6% | 27% |
| Chi-Square Statistic | df | p value | | |
| 13.74 | 6 | 0.03 | | |

School Fees by Number of Education Law Courses Taken

| Number of Courses | Immediately Needed | Critical for Inclusion | Both | Neither |
|----------------------|--------------------|------------------------|------|---------|
| 1 | 13% | 45% | 5% | 37% |
| 2 | 15% | 51% | 9% | 25% |
| 3 or more | 27% | 35% | 6% | 31% |
| Chi-Square Statistic | df | p value | | |
| 14.01 | 6 | 0.03 | | |

Table 15 (continued)

Open Meeting/Public Records Law by Number of Education Law Courses Taken

| Number of Courses | Immediately Needed | Critical for Inclusion | Both | Neither |
|----------------------|--------------------|------------------------|------------|------------|
| 1 | 13% | 49% | 7% | 31% |
| 2 | 17% | 49% | 13% | 21% |
| 3 or more | 27% | 46% | 4% | 23% |
| Chi-Square Statistic | df | p value | | |
| 14.38 | 6 | 0.03 | | |

Domain IV included eight individual law areas, creating 40 possibilities of statistically significant responses. Table 16 displays the 11 responses (28%) within Domain IV, Academic Issues, that were found to have statistically significant differences: Education of EL Students by Highest Completed Educational Degree, School Attendance by Highest Completed Educational Degree, Textbook Selection by District Type, Compulsory Attendance by District Type, Censorship by District Type, School Attendance by District Type, Grading/Promotion by Number of Education Law Courses Taken, Education of EL Students by Number of Education Law Courses Taken, Copyright Law by Number of Education Law Courses Taken, Textbook Selection by Number of Education Law Courses Taken, Textbook Selection by Number of Education Law Courses Taken, and Censorship by Number of Education Law Courses Taken.

Table 16

Education of EL Students by Highest Completed Educational Degree

| Degree | Immediately Needed | Critical for Inclusion | Both | Neither |
|------------------------|--------------------|------------------------|------------|------------|
| Doctorate | 13% | 53% | 15% | 19% |
| Educational Specialist | 22% | 46% | 10% | 23% |
| Masters | 14% | 51% | 20% | 15% |
| Other | 8% | 23% | 35% | 35% |
| Chi-Square Statistic | df | p value | | |
| 26.64 | 9 | 0.00 | | |

School Attendance by Highest Completed Educational Degree

| Degree | Immediately Needed | Critical for Inclusion | Both | Neither |
|------------------------|--------------------|------------------------|------------|------------|
| Doctorate | 13% | 53% | 17% | 18% |
| Educational Specialist | 24% | 39% | 18% | 20% |
| Masters | 13% | 56% | 19% | 12% |
| Other | 12% | 31% | 31% | 27% |
| Chi-Square Statistic | df | p value | | |
| 20.32 | 9 | 0.02 | | |

Textbook Selection by District Type

| District Type | Immediately Needed | Critical for Inclusion | Both | Neither |
|----------------------|--------------------|------------------------|------|------------|
| Rural | 22% | 41% | 6% | 31% |
| Suburban | 11% | 50% | 1% | 38% |
| Urban | 26% | 42% | 0% | 32% |
| Chi-Square Statistic | df | p value | | |
| 18.10 | 6 | 0.01 | | |

Compulsory Attendance by District Type

| District Type | Immediately Needed | Critical for Inclusion | Both | Neither |
|----------------------|--------------------|------------------------|------------|------------|
| Rural | 20% | 44% | 21% | 15% |
| Suburban | 12% | 55% | 12% | 21% |
| Urban | 29% | 52% | 10% | 10% |
| Chi-Square Statistic | df | p value | | |
| 16.76 | 6 | 0.01 | | |

Table 16 (continued)

Censorship by District Type

| District Type | Immediately Needed | Critical for Inclusion | Both | Neither |
|----------------------|--------------------|------------------------|------|------------|
| Rural | 18% | 46% | 9% | 27% |
| Suburban | 8% | 59% | 8% | 25% |
| Urban | 16% | 65% | 6% | 13% |
| Chi-Square Statistic | df | p value | | |
| 14.29 | 6 | 0.03 | | |

School Attendance by District Type

| District Type | Immediately Needed | Critical for Inclusion | Both | Neither |
|----------------------|--------------------|------------------------|------|---------|
| Rural | 21% | 38% | 23% | 18% |
| Suburban | 16% | 53% | 11% | 19% |
| Urban | 23% | 48% | 16% | 13% |
| Chi-Square Statistic | df | p value | | |
| 14.91 | 6 | 0.02 | | |

Grading/Promotion by Number of Education Law Courses Taken

| Number of Courses | Immediately Needed | Critical for Inclusion | Both | Neither |
|----------------------|--------------------|------------------------|------|------------|
| 1 | 14% | 54% | 11% | 21% |
| 2 | 24% | 49% | 14% | 13% |
| 3 or more | 29% | 40% | 8% | 23% |
| Chi-Square Statistic | df | p value | | |
| 14.33 | 6 | 0.03 | | |

Education of EL Students by Number of Education Law Courses Taken

| Number of Courses | Immediately Needed | Critical for Inclusion | Both | Neither |
|----------------------|--------------------|------------------------|------|------------|
| 1 | 16% | 46% | 13% | 25% |
| 2 | 22% | 52% | 15% | 11% |
| 3 or more | 25% | 40% | 13% | 23% |
| Chi-Square Statistic | df | p value | | |
| 14.12 | 6 | 0.03 | | |

Table 16 (continued)

Copyright Law by Number of Education Law Courses Taken

| Number of Courses | Immediately Needed | Critical for Inclusion | Both | Neither |
|----------------------|--------------------|------------------------|------|------------|
| 1 | 13% | 47% | 4% | 35% |
| 2 | 19% | 56% | 9% | 17% |
| 3 or more | 21% | 46% | 8% | 25% |
| Chi-Square Statistic | df | p value | | |
| 18.40 | 6 | 0.01 | | |

Textbook Selection by Number of Education Law Courses Taken

| Number of Courses | Immediately Needed | Critical for Inclusion | Both | Neither |
|----------------------|--------------------|------------------------|-----------|------------|
| 1 | 15% | 44% | 3% | 38% |
| 2 | 20% | 49% | 8% | 24% |
| 3 or more | 31% | 42% | 2% | 25% |
| Chi-Square Statistic | df | p value | | |
| 19.38 | 6 | 0.00 | | |

Censorship by Number of Education Law Courses Taken

| Number of Courses | Immediately Needed | Critical for Inclusion | Both | Neither |
|----------------------|--------------------|------------------------|------|------------|
| 1 | 11% | 51% | 7% | 31% |
| 2 | 17% | 58% | 11% | 14% |
| 3 or more | 27% | 46% | 6% | 21% |
| Chi-Square Statistic | df | p value | | |
| 22.52 | 6 | 0.00 | | |

Domain V included seven individual law areas, creating 35 possibilities of statistically significant responses. Table 17 displays the one response (3%) within Domain V, Exceptional Children, which was found to have statistically significant difference: Extra-Curricular Participation by District Type.

Table 17

Extra-Curricular Participation by District Type

| District Type | Immediately Needed | Critical for Inclusion | Both | Neither |
|----------------------|--------------------|------------------------|-----------|------------|
| Rural | 20% | 41% | 13% | 26% |
| Suburban | 9% | 53% | 8% | 30% |
| Urban | 26% | 52% | 13% | 10% |
| Chi-Square Statistic | df | p value | | |
| 19.54 | 6 | 0.00 | | |

Domain VI included nine individual law areas, creating 45 possibilities of statistically significant responses. Table 18 displays the seven responses (16%) within Domain VI, Tort Liabilities, that were found to have statistically significant differences: Privacy Rights by Highest Earned Educational Degree, Intentional Torts by Highest Earned Educational Degree, Negligence by District Type, Extra-Curricular Activities/Athletic Programs by District Type, Proper Maintenance of Buildings/Grounds by District Type, Extra-Curricular Activities/Athletic Programs by Number of Education Law Courses Taken, and Proper Maintenance of Buildings/Grounds by Number of Education Law Courses Taken.

Table 18

Privacy Rights by Highest Earned Educational Degree

| Degree | Immediately Needed | Critical for Inclusion | Both | Neither |
|------------------------|--------------------|------------------------|------------|------------|
| Doctorate | 4% | 51% | 22% | 23% |
| Educational Specialist | 18% | 47% | 15% | 21% |
| Masters | 9% | 65% | 12% | 14% |
| Other | 8% | 38% | 31% | 23% |
| Chi-Square Statistic | df | p value | | |
| 23.89 | 9 | 0.00 | | |

Table 18 (continued)

Intentional Torts by Highest Earned Educational Degree

| Degree | Immediately Needed | Critical for Inclusion | Both | Neither |
|------------------------|--------------------|------------------------|------|------------|
| Doctorate | 10% | 53% | 13% | 24% |
| Educational Specialist | 16% | 46% | 14% | 24% |
| Masters | 11% | 66% | 12% | 12% |
| Other | 0% | 50% | 12% | 38% |
| Chi-Square Statistic | df | p value | | |
| 19.66 | 9 | 0.02 | | |

Negligence by District Type

| District Type | Immediately Needed | Critical for Inclusion | Both | Neither |
|----------------------|--------------------|------------------------|------------|------------|
| Rural | 17% | 46% | 21% | 16% |
| Suburban | 10% | 57% | 13% | 20% |
| Urban | 19% | 58% | 6% | 16% |
| Chi-Square Statistic | df | p value | | |
| 13.85 | 6 | 0.03 | | |

Extra-Curricular Activities/Athletic Programs by District Type

| District Type | Immediately Needed | Critical for Inclusion | Both | Neither |
|----------------------|--------------------|------------------------|------|------------|
| Rural | 17% | 44% | 8% | 31% |
| Suburban | 9% | 53% | 4% | 33% |
| Urban | 29% | 39% | 10% | 23% |
| Chi-Square Statistic | df | p value | | |
| 13.74 | 6 | 0.03 | | |

Proper Maintenance of Buildings/Grounds by District Type

| District Type | Immediately Needed | Critical for Inclusion | Both | Neither |
|----------------------|--------------------|------------------------|------|------------|
| Rural | 16% | 41% | 7% | 35% |
| Suburban | 10% | 50% | 1% | 40% |
| Urban | 26% | 39% | 6% | 29% |
| Chi-Square Statistic | df | p value | | |
| 17.56 | 6 | 0.01 | | |

Table 18 (continued)

Extra-Curricular Activities/Athletic Programs by Number of Education Law Courses Taken

| Number of Courses | Immediately Needed | Critical for Inclusion | Both | Neither |
|----------------------|--------------------|------------------------|------|------------|
| 1 | 12% | 47% | 5% | 36% |
| 2 | 17% | 50% | 12% | 22% |
| 3 or more | 23% | 46% | 6% | 25% |
| Chi-Square Statistic | df | p value | | |
| 16.89 | 6 | 0.01 | | |

Proper Maintenance of Buildings/Grounds by Number of Education Law Courses Taken

| Number of Courses | Immediately Needed | Critical for Inclusion | Both | Neither |
|----------------------|--------------------|------------------------|------|------------|
| 1 | 11% | 43% | 5% | 41% |
| 2 | 20% | 49% | 4% | 27% |
| 3 or more | 19% | 46% | 8% | 27% |
| Chi-Square Statistic | df | p value | | |
| 14.43 | 6 | 0.03 | | |

Discussion. Of the six education law domains, Exceptional Children, Student Rights, and Teacher and Employment Issues were considered to have the most immediate need for continuing education for Minnesota public school principals. And of the 64 individual education law areas, Staff Evaluation, Harassment (student), Dismissal Procedures (staff), Suspensions/Expulsions, and Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) were considered to have the most immediate need for continuing education for Minnesota public school principals.

Within the six education law domains, responses to the 64 individual areas of education law were analyzed based upon five demographic factors: Position of Employment, Highest Earned Educational Degree, District Type, Years Experience in School Administration, and Number of Education Law Courses Taken. This created

320 responses in which statistically significant differences could have been identified regarding areas of education law in which principals have an immediate need for continuing education. Of the 320 responses possible, only 39 (12%) were identified through analysis to have statistically significant differences. This provides sufficient evidence to reject the null hypothesis.

Research Question and Hypothesis Three

Question Three. Which topics of education law are considered critical for inclusion, or to be given priority, in Minnesota principal licensure programs?

Hypothesis Three. There will be a positive correlation between the perceptions of principals, superintendents, and school district attorneys regarding the topics of education law that are considered critical for inclusion, or to be given priority, in Minnesota principal licensure programs.

Null Hypothesis Three. There is will be no significant correlation between the perceptions of principals, superintendents, and school district attorneys regarding the topics of education law that are considered critical for inclusion, or to be given priority, in Minnesota principal licensure programs.

Findings. In Part II of the survey, participants were also asked to indicate regarding 64 different areas of education laws within the six domains whether the area of law is critical for inclusion in an education law course within a Minnesota principal licensure program. Participant responses to the survey questions for the six domains and 64 areas of education law were again analyzed by total responses of participants, their individual employment position, and their individual employment

position along with their district enrollment size. Once again, the data were analyzed with the objective of determining by rank the areas of law that are critical for inclusion, or to be given priority, in Minnesota principal licensure programs.

Survey participants were also asked in Part II of the survey, Important Areas of Education Law, to identify within the 64 areas of education law those that were critical for inclusion in Minnesota principal licensure programs. “Critical” was defined as being absolutely necessary to a public school principal for a school's operation. The results were again analyzed to determine the rank of the six education law domains by employment group as well as the ten individual law areas by employment group deemed most critical to include in a principal licensure program.

Table 19 displays the six domains ranked in order by the frequency of laws within each domain being identified by respondents as critical for inclusion in principal licensure programs. Overall results are displayed as well as those by employment position. Only a 5% difference exists in the Overall group between the domain deemed most critical for inclusion (Tort Liabilities – 80%) and the domain deemed least critical (Teacher and Employment Issues – 75%). In every group with the exception of Attorneys, Tort Liabilities was ranked highest. Exceptional Children was ranked second highest overall, as well as by the employment groups of Superintendents and Principals. Teacher and Employment Issues received the lowest ranking in all employment groups with the exception of Superintendents, who found that domain less than 1% more critical than Miscellaneous (75%).

Table 19

Law Domains Ranked by Current Employment Position Groupings

| OVERALL | |
|---|---|
| Tort Liabilities – 80% Exceptional Children – 79% Miscellaneous – 79% Student Rights – 77% Academic Issues – 77% Teacher and Employment Issues – 75% | |
| SUPERINTENDENTS | PRINCIPALS |
| Tort Liabilities – 81% Exceptional Children – 80% Student Rights – 77% Academic Issues – 76% Teacher and Employment Issues – 75% Miscellaneous – 75% | Tort Liabilities – 81% Exceptional Children – 81% Miscellaneous – 81% Student Rights – 78% Academic Issues – 78% Teacher and Employment Issues – 76% |
| ASSISTANT PRINCIPALS | ATTORNEYS |
| Tort Liabilities – 80% Student Rights – 79% Exceptional Children – 77% Miscellaneous – 77% Academic Issues – 74% Teacher and Employment Issues – 74% | Academic Issues – 81% Miscellaneous – 80% Exceptional Children – 77% Tort Liabilities – 75% Student Rights – 72% Teacher and Employment Issues – 63% |

Table 20 illustrates the rankings of the 10 individual areas of education law considered most critical for inclusion in a principal licensure program. Rankings were again determined by the following employment groups: Overall, Superintendents, Principals, Assistant Principals, and Attorneys. In the Overall group, only 2% separated the ten areas deemed most critical for inclusion, and none of those ten individual areas in the Overall group were found in the results of every other employment group. Corporal Punishment and Ethics received the highest percentage of responses in the Overall group, with 84% of respondents deeming them critical for

inclusion. The Attorney responses were most apart from the other employment groups, with six of their 10 areas being outside the ten highest ranked individual areas of the other employment groups.

Table 20

Individual Areas Ranked by Current Employment Position Groupings

| OVERALL | |
|---|--|
| Corporal Punishment – 84% Ethics – 84% Privacy Rights – 83% School Finance – 83% Supervision of Students – 83% Intentional Torts (assault, defamation, etc.) – 83% Negligence – 82% Church and State – 82% Student Rights – 82% Parent Rights – 82% | |
| SUPERINTENDENTS | PRINCIPALS |
| Educational Malpractice – 87% Intentional torts (assault, defamation, etc.) – 86% Parent Rights – 86% Supervision of Students – 86% Privacy Rights – 85% Student Rights – 85% Ethics – 85% Corporal Punishment – 84% Sexual Harassment (staff) – 81% Constitutional Rights – 81% | Ethics – 85% Intentional torts (assault, defamation, etc.) – 85% Church and State – 85% Section 1983 (Federal Tort-Constitutional Rights) Actions – 85% Negligence – 84% Privacy Rights – 84% Academic Sanctions for Students – 84% School Finance – 83% Corporal Punishment – 83% Search and Seizure – 83% |

Table 20 (continued)

Individual Areas Ranked by Current Employment Position Groupings

| ASSISTANT PRINCIPALS | ATTORNEYS |
|---|--|
| School Finance – 88% Corporal Punishment – 85% Field Trips – 84% FERPA/Privacy – 83% Censorship – 83% Open Meeting/Public Records Law – 83% Supervision of Students – 82% Legal Research/Case Study Skills – 82% Constitutional Rights – 81% Freedom of Speech (student) – 81% | Desegregation – 100% Historical/Foundational Legal Knowledge of Schools – 100% Legal Research/Case Study Skills – 100% Proper Maintenance of Buildings/Grounds – 100% Reporting Child Abuse – 92% Ethics – 92% Open Meeting/Public Records Law – 92% Education of EL Students – 90% Section 1983 (Federal Tort-Constitutional Rights) Actions – 88% Copyright Law – 88% |

To test the third null hypothesis, the Two-Way Chi-Square Test was again utilized to identify responses in which statistically significant differences occurred between respondents’ perceptions of education law areas considered critical for inclusion, or to be given priority, in Minnesota principal licensure programs. Responses deemed statistically significant have a p-value of .03 or lower. The test was again run using the following five demographic factors: Position of Employment, Highest Earned Educational Degree, District Type, Years Experience in School Administration, and Number of Education Law Courses Taken.

Tables 13 through 18 in the previous section, Research Question and Hypothesis Two, display the responses from the six education law domains in which statistically significant differences were found between respondents’ perceptions of education law areas considered critical for inclusion, or to be given priority, in

Minnesota principal licensure programs. Table 13 displays the five responses (10%) within Domain I, Student Rights, that were found to have statistically significant differences: Dress Codes by Highest Completed Educational Degree, Search and Seizure by Years Experience in School Administration, Corporal Punishment by Years Experience in School Administration, Dress Codes by Years Experience in School Administration, and Corporal Punishment by Number of Education Law Courses Taken.

Table 14 displays the seven responses (13%) within Domain II, Teacher and Employment Issues, that were found to have statistically significant differences: Equal Employment Opportunity by District Type, Leave Issues by District Type, Staff Evaluation by District Type, Collective Bargaining by District Type, Sexual Harassment (student) by Years Experience in School Administration, Staff Evaluation by Years Experience in School Administration, and Privacy or Other Constitutional Rights by Number of Education Law Courses Taken.

Table 15 displays the eight responses (8%) within Domain III, Miscellaneous, that were found to have statistically significant differences: Public Access to School Facilities by Highest Completed Educational Degree, Residency Requirements by District Type, Historical/Foundational Legal Knowledge of Schools by Number of Education Law Courses Taken, Legal Research/Case Study Skills by Number of Education Law Courses Taken, Church and State by Number of Education Law Courses Taken, Residency Requirements by Number of Education Law Courses

Taken, School Fees by Number of Education Law Courses Taken, and Open Meeting/Public Records Law by Number of Education Law Courses Taken.

Table 16 displays the 11 responses (28%) within Domain IV, Academic Issues, that were found to have statistically significant differences: Education of EL Students by Highest Completed Educational Degree, School Attendance by Highest Completed Educational Degree, Textbook Selection by District Type, Compulsory Attendance by District Type, Censorship by District Type, School Attendance by District Type, Grading/Promotion by Number of Education Law Courses Taken, Education of EL Students by Number of Education Law Courses Taken, Copyright Law by Number of Education Law Courses Taken, Textbook Selection by Number of Education Law Courses Taken, Textbook Selection by Number of Education Law Courses Taken, and Censorship by Number of Education Law Courses Taken.

Table 17 displays the one response (3%) within Domain V, Exceptional Children, which was found to have statistically significant difference: Extra-Curricular Participation by District Type.

And Table 18 displays the seven responses (16%) within Domain VI, Tort Liabilities, that were found to have statistically significant differences: Privacy Rights by Highest Earned Educational Degree, Intentional Torts by Highest Earned Educational Degree, Negligence by District Type, Extra-Curricular Activities/Athletic Programs by District Type, Proper Maintenance of Buildings/Grounds by District Type, Extra-Curricular Activities/Athletic Programs by

Number of Education Law Courses Taken, and Proper Maintenance of Buildings/Grounds by Number of Education Law Courses Taken.

Discussion. Of the six education law domains, Tort Liabilities, Exceptional Children, and Miscellaneous were found to be considered most critical for inclusion, or to be given priority, in Minnesota principal licensure programs. And of the 64 individual education law areas, Corporal Punishment, Ethics, Privacy Rights, School Finance, and Supervision of Students were found to be considered most critical for inclusion, or to be given priority, in Minnesota principal licensure programs.

Within the six education law domains, responses to the 64 individual areas of education law were analyzed based upon five demographic factors: Position of Employment, Highest Earned Educational Degree, District Type, Years Experience in School Administration, and Number of Education Law Courses Taken. This created 320 responses in which statistically significant differences could have been identified regarding the areas of education law that are deemed critical for inclusion, or to be given priority, in Minnesota principal licensure programs. Of the 320 responses possible, only 39 (12%) were identified through analysis to have statistically significant differences. This provides sufficient evidence to reject the null hypothesis.

Research Question and Hypothesis Four

Question Four. What avenues for continuing education are considered most convenient and efficient for Minnesota public school principals to attain new knowledge of education law?

Hypothesis Four. There will be a positive correlation between the perceptions of principals, superintendents, and school district attorneys regarding the avenues for continuing education considered most convenient and efficient for Minnesota public school principals to attain new knowledge of education law.

Null Hypothesis Four. There will be no significant correlation between the perceptions of principals, superintendents, and school district attorneys regarding the avenues for continuing education considered most convenient and efficient for Minnesota public school principals to attain new knowledge of education law.

Findings. In Part III of the survey, participants were asked to provide their perceptions regarding preferred avenues for continuing education for public school principals. Participants were asked to identify the convenience and efficiency of continuing education settings for public school principals, and time increments for principals' participation in continuing education.

Five different setting options were available for respondents to select: In-district training, Regional workshops, State-level workshops, Additional graduate-level coursework, and Video-conferencing or online format. Participants were first asked to rank the convenience of each continuing education option, with "convenience" being defined as fitting within an expected amount of time and/or cost. Participants were asked to choose between three levels of convenience: High, Medium, and Low. Participants were next asked to rank the efficiency of each continuing education option, with "efficiency" being defined as meeting a principal's

needs for gaining education law knowledge. Three choices of efficiency were also provided: High, Medium, and Low.

Respondents selected from five different time increment options for continuing education: Full-day education law training once during the school year, half-day education law training twice during the school year, a series of two-hour education law trainings throughout the school year, full-day education law training once during the summer, and a half-day education law training twice during the summer. Again, participants were asked to choose between three levels of convenience and efficiency: High, Medium, and Low.

Survey responses for Part III of the survey were analyzed by total responses of participants, their individual employment position, and their individual employment position (Superintendents, Principals, and Assistant Principals) along with their district enrollment size. As in Part II, district enrollment sizes were broken into four ranges: 1,000 or fewer, 1,000–5,000, 5,001–10,000, and more than 10,000. The data were analyzed with the objective of determining by most convenient and efficient avenues for continuing education for public school principals.

Participants in Part III of the survey were asked to provide their perceptions regarding settings for continuing education for public school principals. Table 21 depicts the responses for the following employment position groups: Overall, Superintendents, Principals and Assistant Principals. The setting of In-district training was clearly chosen by all employment position groups as the most convenient and efficient.

Table 21

Settings for Continuing Education by Current Employment Position Groupings

| Overall | Convenience | | | Efficiency | | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|--------|-----|------------|--------|-----|
| | High | Medium | Low | High | Medium | Low |
| In-district training | 74% | 19% | 7% | 65% | 27% | 8% |
| Regional workshops | 30% | 61% | 8% | 37% | 53% | 10% |
| State-level workshops | 10% | 55% | 35% | 20% | 53% | 26% |
| Additional graduate-level coursework | 6% | 33% | 61% | 15% | 41% | 44% |
| Video-conferencing or online format | 44% | 43% | 13% | 38% | 43% | 19% |

| Superintendents | Convenience | | | Efficiency | | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|--------|-----|------------|--------|-----|
| | High | Medium | Low | High | Medium | Low |
| In-district training | 73% | 22% | 5% | 61% | 33% | 5% |
| Regional workshops | 35% | 56% | 8% | 46% | 46% | 8% |
| State-level workshops | 9% | 57% | 33% | 21% | 54% | 25% |
| Additional graduate-level coursework | 5% | 36% | 59% | 11% | 40% | 49% |
| Video-conferencing or online format | 40% | 46% | 15% | 36% | 45% | 19% |

Settings for Continuing Education by Current Employment Position Groupings

| Principals | Convenience | | | Efficiency | | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|--------|-----|------------|--------|-----|
| | High | Medium | Low | High | Medium | Low |
| In-district training | 72% | 20% | 8% | 64% | 27% | 9% |
| Regional workshops | 33% | 61% | 6% | 37% | 55% | 8% |
| State-level workshops | 9% | 55% | 36% | 20% | 51% | 28% |
| Additional graduate-level coursework | 6% | 32% | 62% | 15% | 42% | 44% |
| Video-conferencing or online format | 43% | 44% | 14% | 36% | 44% | 19% |

| Assistant Principals | Convenience | | | Efficiency | | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|--------|-----|------------|--------|-----|
| | High | Medium | Low | High | Medium | Low |
| In-district training | 76% | 15% | 8% | 69% | 22% | 8% |
| Regional workshops | 24% | 66% | 11% | 33% | 54% | 13% |
| State-level workshops | 14% | 54% | 32% | 22% | 58% | 20% |
| Additional graduate-level coursework | 8% | 32% | 60% | 21% | 40% | 38% |
| Video-conferencing or online format | 48% | 39% | 13% | 41% | 38% | 21% |

Table 22 shows the results of Superintendents based on district enrollment size. In-district training was again deemed the most convenient and efficient by Superintendents in all district enrollment sizes with the exception of districts with more than 10,000 students, due to the fact that only two Superintendents in districts with more than 10,000 students responded. The setting of Regional workshops did show stronger results among Superintendents, especially with enrollment sizes ranging from 5,001 to 10,000, where it was deemed most efficient.

Table 22

Settings for Continuing Education by District Student Enrollment Size Groupings – Superintendents

| Enrollment: 1,000 or fewer | Convenience | | | Efficiency | | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|--------|-----|------------|--------|-----|
| | High | Medium | Low | High | Medium | Low |
| In-district training | 74% | 21% | 5% | 61% | 34% | 5% |
| Regional workshops | 36% | 56% | 8% | 46% | 45% | 8% |
| State-level workshops | 9% | 57% | 34% | 21% | 54% | 25% |
| Additional graduate-level coursework | 5% | 36% | 59% | 12% | 40% | 48% |
| Video-conferencing or online format | 39% | 46% | 15% | 35% | 46% | 19% |

| Enrollment: 1,001 – 5,000 | Convenience | | | Efficiency | | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|--------|-----|------------|--------|-----|
| | High | Medium | Low | High | Medium | Low |
| In-district training | 73% | 21% | 7% | 62% | 31% | 7% |
| Regional workshops | 33% | 60% | 7% | 44% | 47% | 9% |
| State-level workshops | 11% | 59% | 29% | 23% | 57% | 20% |
| Additional graduate-level coursework | 7% | 36% | 57% | 14% | 44% | 42% |
| Video-conferencing or online format | 37% | 49% | 14% | 32% | 48% | 20% |

Table 22 (continued)

Settings for Continuing Education by District Student Enrollment Size Groupings – Superintendents

| Enrollment: 5,001 – 10,000 | Convenience | | | Efficiency | | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|--------|-----|------------|--------|-----|
| | High | Medium | Low | High | Medium | Low |
| In-district training | 86% | 14% | 0% | 43% | 57% | 0% |
| Regional workshops | 43% | 57% | 0% | 57% | 29% | 14% |
| State-level workshops | 0% | 71% | 29% | 29% | 43% | 29% |
| Additional graduate-level coursework | 0% | 43% | 57% | 14% | 14% | 71% |
| Video-conferencing or online format | 43% | 29% | 29% | 43% | 43% | 14% |

| Enrollment: more than 10,000 | Convenience | | | Efficiency | | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|--------|------|------------|--------|------|
| | High | Medium | Low | High | Medium | Low |
| In-district training | 50% | 50% | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0% |
| Regional workshops | 0% | 100% | 0% | 50% | 50% | 0% |
| State-level workshops | 0% | 100% | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0% |
| Additional graduate-level coursework | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0% | 0% | 100% |
| Video-conferencing or online format | 0% | 100% | 0% | 0% | 50% | 50% |

Table 23 displays the results of Principals based upon school district enrollment size. The setting of In-district training was deemed highly convenient and efficient by Principals in all enrollment sizes, especially in districts with enrollments above 5,001, where 86% found In-district trainings to be convenient and 73% found it to be efficient.

Table 23

Settings for Continuing Education by District Student Enrollment Size Groupings – Principals

| Enrollment: 1,000 or fewer | Convenience | | | Efficiency | | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|--------|-----|------------|--------|-----|
| | High | Medium | Low | High | Medium | Low |
| In-district training | 72% | 13% | 14% | 61% | 28% | 12% |
| Regional workshops | 39% | 56% | 6% | 41% | 56% | 3% |
| State-level workshops | 10% | 49% | 41% | 23% | 40% | 37% |
| Additional graduate-level coursework | 3% | 34% | 63% | 10% | 41% | 49% |
| Video-conferencing or online format | 44% | 40% | 16% | 30% | 50% | 20% |

| Enrollment: 1,001 – 5,000 | Convenience | | | Efficiency | | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|--------|-----|------------|--------|-----|
| | High | Medium | Low | High | Medium | Low |
| In-district training | 65% | 28% | 6% | 62% | 28% | 10% |
| Regional workshops | 31% | 62% | 6% | 42% | 51% | 7% |
| State-level workshops | 11% | 59% | 30% | 24% | 61% | 15% |
| Additional graduate-level coursework | 6% | 32% | 62% | 14% | 46% | 41% |
| Video-conferencing or online format | 39% | 49% | 12% | 34% | 48% | 18% |

| Enrollment: 5,001 – 10,000 | Convenience | | | Efficiency | | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|--------|-----|------------|--------|-----|
| | High | Medium | Low | High | Medium | Low |
| In-district training | 86% | 14% | 0% | 73% | 27% | 0% |
| Regional workshops | 27% | 64% | 9% | 29% | 62% | 10% |
| State-level workshops | 18% | 41% | 41% | 32% | 41% | 27% |
| Additional graduate-level coursework | 14% | 36% | 50% | 18% | 45% | 36% |
| Video-conferencing or online format | 32% | 55% | 14% | 50% | 27% | 23% |

| Enrollment: more than 10,000 | Convenience | | | Efficiency | | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|--------|-----|------------|--------|-----|
| | High | Medium | Low | High | Medium | Low |
| In-district training | 86% | 11% | 3% | 70% | 24% | 5% |
| Regional workshops | 22% | 65% | 14% | 11% | 65% | 24% |
| State-level workshops | 3% | 59% | 38% | 6% | 61% | 33% |
| Additional graduate-level coursework | 5% | 32% | 62% | 22% | 32% | 46% |
| Video-conferencing or online format | 49% | 35% | 16% | 43% | 38% | 19% |

Table 24 depicts the results of Assistant Principals based upon school district enrollment size. Again, In-district training was found to be the most convenient and efficient setting for continuing education. Of all Assistant Principals in districts with more than 10,000 students, 81% and 76% found In-district training to be convenient and efficient, respectively.

Table 24

Settings for Continuing Education by District Student Enrollment Size Groupings – Assistant Principals

| Enrollment: 1,000 or fewer | Convenience | | | Efficiency | | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|--------|-----|------------|--------|-----|
| | High | Medium | Low | High | Medium | Low |
| In-district training | 70% | 10% | 20% | 70% | 10% | 20% |
| Regional workshops | 40% | 50% | 10% | 40% | 50% | 10% |
| State-level workshops | 20% | 40% | 40% | 0% | 70% | 30% |
| Additional graduate-level coursework | 10% | 30% | 60% | 10% | 40% | 50% |
| Video-conferencing or online format | 60% | 30% | 10% | 60% | 30% | 10% |

| Enrollment: 1,001 – 5,000 | Convenience | | | Efficiency | | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|--------|-----|------------|--------|-----|
| | High | Medium | Low | High | Medium | Low |
| In-district training | 73% | 19% | 7% | 67% | 25% | 7% |
| Regional workshops | 29% | 63% | 9% | 39% | 51% | 11% |
| State-level workshops | 15% | 55% | 30% | 24% | 59% | 17% |
| Additional graduate-level coursework | 7% | 38% | 54% | 16% | 49% | 35% |
| Video-conferencing or online format | 37% | 49% | 14% | 37% | 45% | 18% |

| Enrollment: 5,001 – 10,000 | Convenience | | | Efficiency | | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|--------|-----|------------|--------|-----|
| | High | Medium | Low | High | Medium | Low |
| In-district training | 100% | 0% | 0% | 50% | 40% | 10% |
| Regional workshops | 10% | 90% | 0% | 30% | 50% | 20% |
| State-level workshops | 0% | 70% | 30% | 30% | 40% | 30% |
| Additional graduate-level coursework | 10% | 40% | 50% | 50% | 30% | 20% |
| Video-conferencing or online format | 60% | 20% | 20% | 40% | 30% | 30% |

Table 24 (continued)

Settings for Continuing Education by District Student Enrollment Size Groupings – Assistant Principals

| Enrollment: more than 10,000 | Convenience | | | Efficiency | | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|--------|-----|------------|--------|-----|
| | High | Medium | Low | High | Medium | Low |
| In-district training | 81% | 19% | 0% | 76% | 24% | 0% |
| Regional workshops | 19% | 57% | 24% | 19% | 67% | 14% |
| State-level workshops | 14% | 43% | 43% | 19% | 48% | 33% |
| Additional graduate-level coursework | 5% | 14% | 81% | 15% | 20% | 65% |
| Video-conferencing or online format | 57% | 29% | 14% | 43% | 33% | 24% |

To test the fourth null hypothesis, the Two-Way Chi-Square Test was again utilized to identify responses in which statistically significant differences occurred between respondents' perceptions of the most convenient and efficient settings for continuing education. Responses deemed statistically significant have a p-value of .03 or lower. The test was again run using the following five demographic factors: Position of Employment, Highest Earned Educational Degree, District Type, Years Experience in School Administration, and Number of Education Law Courses Taken.

Part III of the survey included five options for continuing education settings, creating the possibility of 25 statistically significant responses. Table 25 displays the three responses (12%) that were found to have statistically significant differences: Regional Workshops by District Type, In-District Training by Years Experience in School Administration, and Regional Workshops by District Type.

Table 25

Regional Workshops by District Type

| District Type | High Convenience | Low Convenience | Medium Convenience |
|----------------------|------------------|-----------------|--------------------|
| Rural | 39% | 4% | 57% |
| Suburban | 18% | 13% | 69% |
| Urban | 25% | 14% | 61% |
| Chi-Square Statistic | df | p value | |
| 25.58 | 6 | 0.00 | |

In-District Training by Years Experience in School Administration

| Experience | High Convenience | Low Convenience | Medium Convenience |
|----------------------|------------------|-----------------|--------------------|
| 1-5 years | 66% | 11% | 23% |
| 6-10 years | 86% | 5% | 9% |
| 11-15 years | 77% | 9% | 14% |
| 16-20 years | 64% | 2% | 34% |
| 21-25 years | 80% | 0% | 20% |
| 26 or more | 57% | 14% | 30% |
| Chi-Square Statistic | df | p value | |
| 35.20 | 15 | 0.00 | |

Regional Workshops by District Type

| District Type | High Efficiency | Low Efficiency | Medium Efficiency |
|----------------------|-----------------|----------------|-------------------|
| Rural | 47% | 5% | 48% |
| Suburban | 24% | 17% | 59% |
| Urban | 21% | 11% | 68% |
| Chi-Square Statistic | df | p value | |
| 30.32 | 6 | 0.00 | |

Participants in Part III of the survey were asked to provide their perceptions regarding time increments for continuing education for public school principals. Table 26 displays the responses for the following employment position groups: Overall, Superintendents, Principals and Assistant Principals. Five different time increment options for continuing education were available from which respondents

could select: Full-day education law training once during the school year, half-day education law training twice during the school year, a series of two-hour education law trainings throughout the school year, full-day education law training once during the summer, and a half-day education law training twice during the summer.

The results show among the Overall grouping the time increment option of Full-day education law training once during the summer was deemed most convenient and efficient, slightly ahead of the Full-day education law training once during the school year. Assistant Principals responded that the Full-day option during the summer was most convenient and efficient, with 63% and 59% responses, respectively.

Table 26

Time Increments by Current Employment Position Groupings

| Overall | Convenience | | | Efficiency | | |
|---|-------------|--------|-----|------------|--------|-----|
| | High | Medium | Low | High | Medium | Low |
| Full-day education law training once during the school year | 48% | 39% | 13% | 51% | 39% | 10% |
| Half-day education law training twice during the school year | 27% | 55% | 18% | 25% | 57% | 18% |
| Series of two-hour education law trainings throughout the school year | 19% | 33% | 48% | 17% | 41% | 42% |
| Full-day education law training once during the summer | 53% | 34% | 13% | 53% | 35% | 12% |
| Half-day education law training twice during the summer | 40% | 42% | 18% | 40% | 45% | 15% |

Table 26 (continued)

Time Increments by Current Employment Position Groupings

| Superintendents | Convenience | | | Efficiency | | |
|---|-------------|--------|-----|------------|--------|-----|
| | High | Medium | Low | High | Medium | Low |
| Full-day education law training once during the school year | 36% | 44% | 20% | 48% | 38% | 13% |
| Half-day education law training twice during the school year | 26% | 49% | 25% | 23% | 56% | 22% |
| Series of two-hour education law trainings throughout the school year | 20% | 37% | 43% | 23% | 38% | 40% |
| Full-day education law training once during the summer | 48% | 39% | 12% | 56% | 34% | 9% |
| Half-day education law training twice during the summer | 34% | 51% | 15% | 34% | 54% | 11% |

| Principals | Convenience | | | Efficiency | | |
|---|-------------|--------|-----|------------|--------|-----|
| | High | Medium | Low | High | Medium | Low |
| Full-day education law training once during the school year | 55% | 38% | 8% | 52% | 39% | 9% |
| Half-day education law training twice during the school year | 27% | 58% | 15% | 26% | 59% | 15% |
| Series of two-hour education law trainings throughout the school year | 16% | 31% | 53% | 14% | 42% | 45% |
| Full-day education law training once during the summer | 52% | 33% | 16% | 48% | 34% | 17% |
| Half-day education law training twice during the summer | 40% | 39% | 20% | 40% | 42% | 18% |

Table 26 (continued)

Time Increments by Current Employment Position Groupings

| Assistant Principals | Convenience | | | Efficiency | | |
|---|-------------|--------|-----|------------|--------|-----|
| | High | Medium | Low | High | Medium | Low |
| Full-day education law training once during the school year | 49% | 39% | 12% | 51% | 38% | 11% |
| Half-day education law training twice during the school year | 27% | 53% | 20% | 22% | 54% | 24% |
| Series of two-hour education law trainings throughout the school year | 21% | 32% | 47% | 18% | 40% | 42% |
| Full-day education law training once during the summer | 63% | 27% | 10% | 59% | 36% | 5% |
| Half-day education law training twice during the summer | 46% | 38% | 16% | 44% | 43% | 13% |

Table 27 displays the results from Superintendents based on district enrollment size. The time increment of Full-day training during the summer received the strongest responses at 57%. Of the Superintendents in districts with enrollment sizes between 5,001 and 10,000, 57% also found the Series of two-hour education law trainings throughout the school year time increment to be most convenient. The Half-day training twice during the summer was also deemed most efficient along with the Full-day summer training by 57% of Superintendents in districts with enrollment sizes between 5,001 and 10,000.

Table 27

Time Increments by District Student Enrollment Size Groupings – Superintendents

| Enrollment: 1,000 or fewer | Convenience | | | Efficiency | | |
|---|-------------|--------|-----|------------|--------|-----|
| | High | Medium | Low | High | Medium | Low |
| Full-day education law training once during the school year | 36% | 45% | 19% | 49% | 38% | 14% |
| Half-day education law training twice during the school year | 26% | 50% | 24% | 23% | 55% | 22% |
| Series of two-hour education law trainings throughout the school year | 20% | 38% | 43% | 23% | 37% | 40% |
| Full-day education law training once during the summer | 49% | 39% | 13% | 57% | 34% | 9% |
| Half-day education law training twice during the summer | 35% | 51% | 15% | 35% | 54% | 12% |

| Enrollment: 1,001 – 5,000 | Convenience | | | Efficiency | | |
|---|-------------|--------|-----|------------|--------|-----|
| | High | Medium | Low | High | Medium | Low |
| Full-day education law training once during the school year | 40% | 45% | 15% | 48% | 40% | 12% |
| Half-day education law training twice during the school year | 25% | 56% | 19% | 24% | 59% | 17% |
| Series of two-hour education law trainings throughout the school year | 18% | 40% | 42% | 20% | 43% | 37% |
| Full-day education law training once during the summer | 52% | 36% | 12% | 53% | 38% | 9% |
| Half-day education law training twice during the summer | 36% | 48% | 15% | 35% | 51% | 13% |

Table 27 (continued)

Time Increments by District Student Enrollment Size Groupings – Superintendents

| Enrollment: 5,001 – 10,000 | Convenience | | | Efficiency | | |
|---|-------------|--------|-----|------------|--------|-----|
| | High | Medium | Low | High | Medium | Low |
| Full-day education law training once during the school year | 14% | 57% | 29% | 29% | 43% | 29% |
| Half-day education law training twice during the school year | 29% | 29% | 43% | 29% | 43% | 29% |
| Series of two-hour education law trainings throughout the school year | 57% | 14% | 29% | 33% | 17% | 50% |
| Full-day education law training once during the summer | 57% | 29% | 14% | 57% | 14% | 29% |
| Half-day education law training twice during the summer | 14% | 57% | 29% | 57% | 14% | 29% |

| Enrollment: more than 10,000 | Convenience | | | Efficiency | | |
|---|-------------|--------|-----|------------|--------|-----|
| | High | Medium | Low | High | Medium | Low |
| Full-day education law training once during the school year | 0% | 50% | 50% | 50% | 50% | 0% |
| Half-day education law training twice during the school year | 50% | 50% | 0% | 50% | 0% | 50% |
| Series of two-hour education law trainings throughout the school year | 0% | 50% | 50% | 0% | 50% | 50% |
| Full-day education law training once during the summer | 50% | 50% | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0% |
| Half-day education law training twice during the summer | 50% | 0% | 50% | 0% | 50% | 50% |

Table 28 shows the results from Principals based on school district enrollment size. Support for the Full-day training during the school year was stronger among Principals, with 64% of respondents finding it most convenient and efficient in district with enrollments between 5,001 and 10,000. Of the Principals in districts with 1,000 or fewer students, 64% also found it most convenient during the school year. Support was nearly as strong for the Full-day training during the summer, with 68%

of Principals responding as such among districts with enrollments between 5,001 and 10,000.

Table 28

Time Increments by District Student Enrollment Size Groupings – Principals

| Enrollment: 1,000 or fewer | Convenience | | | Efficiency | | |
|---|-------------|--------|-----|------------|--------|-----|
| | High | Medium | Low | High | Medium | Low |
| Full-day education law training once during the school year | 64% | 29% | 7% | 57% | 37% | 6% |
| Half-day education law training twice during the school year | 24% | 57% | 19% | 20% | 61% | 19% |
| Series of two-hour education law trainings throughout the school year | 7% | 30% | 63% | 6% | 36% | 59% |
| Full-day education law training once during the summer | 57% | 29% | 14% | 54% | 27% | 19% |
| Half-day education law training twice during the summer | 43% | 36% | 21% | 41% | 37% | 21% |

| Enrollment: 1,001 – 5,000 | Convenience | | | Efficiency | | |
|---|-------------|--------|-----|------------|--------|-----|
| | High | Medium | Low | High | Medium | Low |
| Full-day education law training once during the school year | 46% | 43% | 11% | 49% | 42% | 9% |
| Half-day education law training twice during the school year | 26% | 55% | 19% | 27% | 59% | 15% |
| Series of two-hour education law trainings throughout the school year | 17% | 33% | 50% | 16% | 45% | 39% |
| Full-day education law training once during the summer | 51% | 35% | 15% | 48% | 39% | 13% |
| Half-day education law training twice during the summer | 38% | 42% | 20% | 41% | 42% | 17% |

Table 28 (continued)

Time Increments by District Student Enrollment Size Groupings – Principals

| Enrollment: 5,001 – 10,000 | Convenience | | | Efficiency | | |
|---|-------------|--------|-----|------------|--------|-----|
| | High | Medium | Low | High | Medium | Low |
| Full-day education law training once during the school year | 64% | 32% | 5% | 64% | 23% | 14% |
| Half-day education law training twice during the school year | 18% | 68% | 14% | 23% | 68% | 9% |
| Series of two-hour education law trainings throughout the school year | 9% | 27% | 64% | 0% | 59% | 41% |
| Full-day education law training once during the summer | 55% | 32% | 14% | 68% | 23% | 9% |
| Half-day education law training twice during the summer | 41% | 36% | 23% | 45% | 45% | 9% |

| Enrollment: more than 10,000 | Convenience | | | Efficiency | | |
|---|-------------|--------|-----|------------|--------|-----|
| | High | Medium | Low | High | Medium | Low |
| Full-day education law training once during the school year | 41% | 46% | 14% | 43% | 41% | 16% |
| Half-day education law training twice during the school year | 33% | 56% | 11% | 38% | 49% | 14% |
| Series of two-hour education law trainings throughout the school year | 35% | 27% | 38% | 33% | 33% | 33% |
| Full-day education law training once during the summer | 49% | 35% | 16% | 36% | 47% | 17% |
| Half-day education law training twice during the summer | 41% | 41% | 19% | 36% | 50% | 14% |

Table 29 shows the results of Assistant Principals based on school district enrollment size. The highest concentration of support for a specific time increment was among Assistant Principals with enrollments of 1,000 or fewer, of whom 70% found the Full-day training during the school year most convenient, and 60% found it most efficient. The Full-day training during the summer was found most convenient and efficient by Assistant Principals in all other district enrollment groupings.

Table 29

Time Increments for by District Student Enrollment Size Groupings – Assistant Principals

| Enrollment: 1,000 or fewer | Convenience | | | Efficiency | | |
|---|-------------|--------|-----|------------|--------|-----|
| | High | Medium | Low | High | Medium | Low |
| Full-day education law training once during the school year | 70% | 20% | 10% | 60% | 40% | 0% |
| Half-day education law training twice during the school year | 30% | 40% | 30% | 30% | 40% | 30% |
| Series of two-hour education law trainings throughout the school year | 40% | 20% | 40% | 40% | 20% | 40% |
| Full-day education law training once during the summer | 44% | 56% | 0% | 40% | 60% | 0% |
| Half-day education law training twice during the summer | 40% | 60% | 0% | 50% | 50% | 0% |

| Enrollment: 1,001 – 5,000 | Convenience | | | Efficiency | | |
|---|-------------|--------|-----|------------|--------|-----|
| | High | Medium | Low | High | Medium | Low |
| Full-day education law training once during the school year | 48% | 44% | 9% | 53% | 39% | 8% |
| Half-day education law training twice during the school year | 29% | 54% | 17% | 25% | 61% | 14% |
| Series of two-hour education law trainings throughout the school year | 19% | 37% | 44% | 17% | 46% | 37% |
| Full-day education law training once during the summer | 57% | 32% | 12% | 55% | 37% | 8% |
| Half-day education law training twice during the summer | 39% | 44% | 17% | 39% | 47% | 14% |

Table 29 (continued)

Time Increments for by District Student Enrollment Size Groupings – Assistant Principals

| Enrollment: 5,001 – 10,000 | Convenience | | | Efficiency | | |
|---|-------------|--------|-----|------------|--------|-----|
| | High | Medium | Low | High | Medium | Low |
| Full-day education law training once during the school year | 30% | 50% | 20% | 20% | 60% | 20% |
| Half-day education law training twice during the school year | 20% | 50% | 30% | 20% | 40% | 40% |
| Series of two-hour education law trainings throughout the school year | 30% | 20% | 50% | 10% | 50% | 40% |
| Full-day education law training once during the summer | 60% | 30% | 10% | 70% | 30% | 0% |
| Half-day education law training twice during the summer | 60% | 20% | 20% | 60% | 20% | 20% |

| Enrollment: more than 10,000 | Convenience | | | Efficiency | | |
|---|-------------|--------|-----|------------|--------|-----|
| | High | Medium | Low | High | Medium | Low |
| Full-day education law training once during the school year | 29% | 52% | 19% | 35% | 45% | 20% |
| Half-day education law training twice during the school year | 29% | 52% | 19% | 19% | 52% | 29% |
| Series of two-hour education law trainings throughout the school year | 19% | 29% | 52% | 19% | 38% | 43% |
| Full-day education law training once during the summer | 57% | 24% | 19% | 48% | 38% | 14% |
| Half-day education law training twice during the summer | 48% | 24% | 29% | 35% | 45% | 20% |

To test the fourth null hypothesis, the Two-Way Chi-Square Test was again utilized to identify responses in which statistically significant differences occurred between respondents' perceptions of the most convenient and efficient settings for continuing education. Responses deemed statistically significant have a p-value of .03 or lower. The test was again run using the following five demographic factors:

Position of Employment, Highest Earned Educational Degree, District Type, Years Experience in School Administration, and Number of Education Law Courses Taken.

Part III of the survey included five options for time increments, creating the possibility of 25 statistically significant responses. Table 30 displays the two responses (8%) that were found to have statistically significant differences: Full-Day Education Law Training Once During the School Year by Highest Earned Educational Degree, and Series of Two-Hour Education Law Trainings During the School Year by District Type.

Table 30

Full-Day Education Law Training Once During the School Year by Highest Earned Educational Degree

| Degree | High Convenience | Low Convenience | Medium Convenience |
|------------------------|------------------|-----------------|--------------------|
| Doctorate | 44% | 16% | 41% |
| Educational Specialist | 50% | 10% | 40% |
| Masters | 55% | 10% | 35% |
| Other | 23% | 36% | 41% |
| Chi-Square Statistic | df | p value | |
| 18.23 | 9 | 0.03 | |

Series of Two-Hour Education Law Trainings During the School Year by District Type

| District Type | High Convenience | Low Convenience | Medium Convenience |
|----------------------|------------------|-----------------|--------------------|
| Rural | 12% | 52% | 35% |
| Suburban | 27% | 44% | 29% |
| Urban | 36% | 32% | 32% |
| Chi-Square Statistic | df | p value | |
| 18.73 | 6 | 0.00 | |

Discussion. A full-day, in-district education law training once during the summer was found to be considered the most convenient and efficient continuing

education avenue for Minnesota public school principals to attain new knowledge of education law.

Responses to the five options for continuing education settings and five options for continuing education time increments were also analyzed based upon five demographic factors: Position of Employment, Highest Earned Educational Degree, District Type, Years Experience in School Administration, and Number of Education Law Courses Taken. This created 50 responses in which statistically significant differences could have been identified regarding avenues for continuing education considered most convenient and efficient for Minnesota public school principals to attain new knowledge of education law. Of the 50 responses possible, only five (10%) were identified through analysis to have statistically significant differences. This provides sufficient evidence to reject the null hypothesis.

Research Question and Hypothesis Five

Question Five. What, if any, differences in perceptions exist between Minnesota public school principals, superintendents, and school district attorneys and Montana public school principals, superintendents, and school district attorneys?

Hypothesis Five. There will be consistency between the perceptions of Minnesota principals, superintendents, and school district attorneys and Montana principals, superintendents, and school district attorneys.

Null Hypothesis Five. There will be inconsistency between the perceptions of Minnesota principals, superintendents, and school district attorneys and Montana principals, superintendents, and school district attorneys.

Findings. For research question one, which sought to determine the areas of education law that are essential for Minnesota public school principals to know, the responses of Minnesota public school principals, superintendents, and school district attorneys were consistent with the findings of Magone (2007), in which domains of Exceptional Children, Student Rights, and Teacher and Employment Issues were also found to be the highest ranked of the six domains, as shown in Tables 1 and 2. In addition, nine of the ten highest ranked individual areas of education law, as shown in Table 3, are the same, though in different order with the areas of Harassment (student), Dismissal Procedures (staff), and Suspensions/Expulsions found as the highest ranked.

For research question two, which sought to determine the areas of education law which have the most immediate need for continuing education, the results displayed in Table 11 are consistent with Magone (2007), as the education law domains of Exceptional Children and Student Rights were found to be the highest ranked, while the domain of Tort Liabilities was found the lowest ranked. Furthermore, the results shown in Table 12 bear some consistency to Magone (2007), with six of the individual areas also ranked among the top ten, including four out of the six highest ranked areas: Harassment (student), Dismissal Procedures (staff), Suspensions/Expulsions, and Staff Evaluation.

For research question three, which sought to determine the areas of education law that are perceived to be critical for inclusion, or to be given priority, in Minnesota principal licensure programs, the findings shown in Table 19 have some consistency

to those of Magone (2007). While the highest ranked domain was Academic Issues, Exceptional Children and Miscellaneous were both found as the second and third highest ranked, respectively. They were followed by Tort Liabilities, Student Rights, and Teacher and Employment Issues. However, the results shown in Table 20 are inconsistent with the findings of Magone (2007), with only two individual education law areas found among the ten highest ranked from Magone's study—Corporal Punishment (third) and Church and State (fourth).

Finally, for research question four, which sought to identify the avenues for continuing education considered most convenient and efficient for Minnesota public school principals to attain new knowledge of education law, the findings displayed in Table 21 were consistent with that of Magone (2007), as In-district training was deemed the most convenient and efficient setting. And the findings depicted in Table 26 are similar to the findings of Magone (2007), with respondents of both studies selecting the Full-day training time increment to be the most convenient and efficient, but respondents of the Magone study viewed the full-day during the school year as more convenient and efficient, while Minnesota respondents preferred the full-day during the summer as the most convenient and efficient.

Discussion. Overall, the data showed consistency in the responses between Minnesota public school principals, superintendents, and school district attorneys, and Montana public school principals, superintendents, and school district attorneys. Differences in perceptions was found particularly in regards to the areas of education law considered critical for inclusion, or to be given priority, in principal licensure

programs, as only two areas (Corporal Punishment and Church and State) were found among the ten highest ranked of both studies.

Thus, to summarize the null hypothesis findings, Table 31 displays each null hypothesis and the correlating finding based upon the analysis of the data.

Table 31

Null Hypotheses Findings

| Null Hypotheses | Accept/Reject |
|--|---------------|
| 1. There will be no significant correlation between the perceptions of principals, superintendents, and school district attorneys regarding the areas of education law essential for Minnesota public school principals to know. | Reject |
| 2. There will be no significant correlation between the perceptions of principals, superintendents, and school district attorneys regarding the areas of education law that Minnesota public school principals have the most immediate need for continuing education. | Reject |
| 3. There will be no significant correlation between the perceptions of principals, superintendents, and school district attorneys regarding the topics of education law that are considered critical for inclusion, or to be given priority, in Minnesota principal licensure programs. | Reject |
| 4. There will be no significant correlation between the perceptions of principals, superintendents, and school district attorneys regarding the avenues for continuing education considered most convenient and efficient for Minnesota public school principals to attain new knowledge of education law. | Reject |
| 5. There will be inconsistency between the perceptions of Minnesota principals, superintendents, and school district attorneys and Montana principals, superintendents, and school district attorneys. | Reject |

Chapter V

Discussions, Implications, Recommendations

This chapter includes the overview, implications, and recommendations of the study and is organized by the following sections: a) Overview of the Study, b) Research Questions, c) Conclusions, d) Implications, e) Recommendations for Practitioners, f) Recommendations for Academics, and g) Concluding Comments.

Overview of the Study

This quantitative study was undertaken to identify critical information in order to help prepare Minnesota public school districts, specifically principals and would-be principals, to address the challenging and ever-changing nature of education law and the significant perils of education litigation. To accomplish this, the perceptions of Minnesota public school principals, superintendents, and school district attorneys were sought and ascertained in June of 2013. Of the 2,380 Minnesota public school principals and superintendents, along with 64 attorneys, who received a request to participate in this study, 494 completed surveys were submitted, including 127 superintendents, 350 principals, and 17 school district attorneys.

The exploratory, descriptive survey used in this study included three parts. Part I, Demographic Information, asked participants for their demographic data. Part II, Important Areas of Education Law for Principals, asked respondents about education law areas essential for public school principals to know, and level of need

for continuing education in those areas. In addition, respondents were asked which education law areas are critical for inclusion, or to be given priority, in education law coursework within principal licensure programs. And Part III, Continuing Education for Principals, asked respondents several questions to identify the most convenient and efficient avenues for Minnesota public school principals to receive continuing education on education law matters.

This study extended the research of Magone (2007), whose study from the state of Montana also collected the perceptions of education law from Montana public school principals, superintendents, and school district attorneys. The findings of this study were then analyzed and compared to those of Magone, as Minnesota and Montana have different education laws and statutes, and due to the period of time between the two studies where significant education law changes may have occurred.

Research Questions

This study was conducted using the following five research questions:

1. Which areas of education law are considered essential for Minnesota public school principals to know?
2. What are the areas of education law that public school principals have the most immediate need for continuing education?
3. Which topics of education law are considered critical for inclusion, or to be given priority, in Minnesota principal licensure programs?

4. What avenues for continuing education are considered most convenient and efficient for Minnesota public school principals to attain new knowledge of education law?
5. What, if any, differences in perceptions exist between Minnesota public school principals, superintendents, and school district attorneys and Montana public school principals, superintendents, and school district attorneys?

Conclusions

Research Question One Conclusions—Essential Areas. The 64 total individual areas of education law (the full list may be found in Appendix A) were grouped into six domains:

- Student Rights
- Teacher and Employment Issues
- Miscellaneous
- Academic Issues
- Exceptional Children
- Tort Liabilities

Of the six education law domains, Exceptional Children was found by all employment position groups to be the most essential for Minnesota public school principals to know. The domain of Student Rights, followed closely by Teacher and Employment Issues were found to be considered the second and third most essential education law domains for Minnesota public school principals to know. Slight

inconsistency was found among the employment position groups, as Assistant Principals ranked Teacher and Employment Issues just ahead of Student Rights, and Attorneys found Teacher and Employment Issues as the fifth most essential domain, only slightly ahead of Tort Liabilities.

Of the 64 individual education law areas, Suspensions/Expulsions, Harassment (student), Staff Evaluation, Dismissal Procedures (staff), and Reporting Child Abuse were found to be considered the most essential individual education law areas for Minnesota public school principals to know. All employment position groups found Suspensions/Expulsions to be the most essential except for Attorneys, who ranked Reporting Child Abuse and Due Process for Students or Staff slightly higher.

Research Question Two Conclusions—Continuing Education. Of the six education law domains, all employment position groups found Exceptional Children, Student Rights, and Teacher and Employment Issues as being considered to have the most immediate need for continuing education for Minnesota public school principals. Slight inconsistency existed among the order, however. Exceptional Children ranked first in all employment position groups with the exception of Superintendents, who ranked Student Rights slightly higher. Student Rights was ranked second in the Overall group and by Principals, but third by Assistant Principals and Attorneys. And Teacher and Employment Issues was ranked third in the Overall group, but second by Assistant Principals and Attorneys.

The individual education law areas of Staff Evaluation, Harassment (student), Dismissal Procedures (staff), Suspensions/Expulsions, and Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) were considered to have the most immediate need for continuing education for Minnesota public school principals. In all employment groups except Attorneys, Staff Evaluation ranked highest. Coming in second in all employment groups with the exception of Assistant Principals was Harassment (student). Dismissal Procedures (staff) and Suspensions/Expulsions each received the third highest ranking overall.

Thus, the same three domains and four individual areas were found as both essential for principals to know and in need of immediate continuing education: Exceptional Children, Teacher and Employment Issues; and Student Rights, along with Suspensions/Expulsions, Harassment (student), Staff Evaluation, and Dismissal Procedures (staff). It can therefore be concluded that the essential areas of education law are also those most in need of immediate continuing education.

Research Question Three Conclusions—Principal Licensure Programs.

The education law domains of Tort Liabilities, Exceptional Children, and Miscellaneous were considered most critical for inclusion, or to be given priority, in Minnesota principal licensure programs. All domains received consistent responses, as only a 5% difference in the Overall group separated the domain deemed most critical for inclusion, Tort Liabilities (80%), and the domain deemed least critical, Teacher and Employment Issues (75%). Tort Liabilities was ranked highest in every employment position group with the exception of Attorneys. Exceptional Children

was ranked second highest overall, as well as by the employment position groups of Superintendents and Principals.

The individual education law areas of Corporal Punishment, Ethics, Privacy Rights, School Finance, and Supervision of Students were found to be considered most critical for inclusion, or to be given priority, in Minnesota principal licensure programs, though the results were very close throughout all employment position groups. It should be noted that Minnesota statutes prohibits corporal punishment in public education (Minnesota Office of the Revisor of Statutes, 2013). Only 2% separated the ten areas deemed most critical for inclusion in the Overall employment position group, and no other employment position group included all ten individual law areas from the Overall group. Superintendents ranked Educational Malpractice (87%) as most critical for inclusion, while Principals found several individual law areas tied (85%) as most critical for inclusion: Ethics, Intentional torts (assault, defamation, etc.), Church and State, and Section 1983 (Federal Tort-Constitutional Rights) Actions. Assistant Principals ranked School Finance (88%) as most critical for inclusion, but Attorneys also found several individual law areas tied (100%) as most critical for inclusion: Desegregation, Historical/Foundational Legal Knowledge of Schools, Legal Research/Case Study Skills, and Proper Maintenance of Buildings/Grounds.

Research Question Four Conclusions—Avenues for Continuing Education. For Minnesota public school principals to attain new knowledge of education law, the setting of “in-district training” and the time increment of “full-day

education law training once during the summer” were found to be considered the most convenient and efficient continuing education avenue. All employment position groups were consistent in ranking the setting of “in-district training” as the most convenient and efficient, by far. And while the “full-day education law training” was clearly the most preferred time increment by all employment position groups, the findings were much closer between the full-day training during the summer or during the school year. Ultimately, the summer training option was ranked slightly higher than the school year training option.

Research Question Five Conclusions—Perception Comparison. The results of this study showed much consistency between the perceptions of Minnesota public school principals, superintendents, and school district attorneys and Montana public school principals, superintendents, and school district attorneys.

The education law domains of Exceptional Children, Student Rights, and Teacher and Employment Issues were found to have the highest rankings in terms of which domains were essential for public school principals to know. In addition, nine of the ten highest ranked individual areas of education law were the same, though in different order. The individual areas of Harassment (student), Dismissal Procedures (staff), and Suspensions/Expulsions found by both studies as the highest ranked.

The areas of education law with the most immediate need for continuing education were consistent with Magone (2007), as the education law domains of Exceptional Children and Student Rights were found to be the highest ranked, while the domain of Tort Liabilities was found the lowest ranked. Furthermore, six of the

individual education law areas also ranked among the top ten, including four out of the six highest ranked areas: Harassment (student), Dismissal Procedures (staff), Suspensions/Expulsions, and Staff Evaluation.

Some consistency was also found among the domains of education law that are considered critical for inclusion, or to be given priority, in principal licensure programs. While the highest ranked domain was different, Exceptional Children and Miscellaneous were both found as the second and third highest ranked, respectively. However, differences in perceptions were found regarding the individual areas of education law considered critical for inclusion. Only two individual education law areas among Minnesota respondents were found among the ten highest ranked individual areas among Montana respondents—Corporal Punishment (third) and Church and State (fourth).

Consistency was found between Minnesota respondents and Montana respondents in terms of the avenues for continuing education considered most convenient and efficient for public school principals to attain new knowledge of education law. In-district training was deemed the most convenient and efficient setting in both studies, and respondents of both studies also selected the Full-day training time increment to be the most convenient and efficient. The only difference found was regarding full-day training being held during the school year or in the summer. Minnesota respondents preferred the full-day during the summer as the most convenient and efficient, while Montana respondents preferred the full-day training during the school year.

Thus, the perceptions of Minnesota public school principals, superintendents, and school district attorneys were found to be consistent with the perceptions of Montana public school principals, superintendents, and school district attorneys. The most notable difference in perceptions was found surrounding the areas of education law considered critical for inclusion, or to be given priority, in principal licensure programs, as only two areas were found among the ten highest ranked of both studies.

Implications

With the perceptions of Minnesota public school principals, superintendents, and school district attorney gathered and analyzed, it is hoped that this study will:

1. Add to the body of research and provide additional knowledge regarding Minnesota administrators' perceptions of education law.
2. Support Minnesota public school districts working independently or in collaboration with the Minnesota Department of Education to deliver the necessary continuing education regarding education law to current principals using the most convenient and efficient avenues.
3. Assist principal licensure programs in Minnesota, as well as the Minnesota Board of School Administrators, through the utilization of the results of this study as they enhance and strengthen their existing education law courses to meet the specific needs of principal licensure candidates based on the current and up-to-date information found in this study.

Baruch and Holtom (2008) documented the nearly 25% decline of response rates from 1975 to 1995 for studies which used questionnaires as the basis for data

collection. Lack of success in contacting the target population and the disinclination of the targeted population to respond were determined to be the primary reasons. Unfortunately, this study was not an exception to the noted trend, achieving a 20% response rate despite a general adherence to nearly all of the items on the Response Rate Review Checklist (p. 1155) by Baruch and Holtom. Among employment position groups, superintendents achieved a 39% response rate, principals achieved a 17% response rate, and attorneys achieved a 26% response rate.

Thus, while this study achieved a smaller-than-desired response rate, which could have a negative impact on its implications, it is necessary to note that 100% of respondents to this study were among the targeted population, including 71% (350/494) of total respondents identifying themselves as licensed Minnesota principals.

Recommendations for Practitioners

As a result of this study, the following recommendations are being made for practitioners:

1. This study identified which areas of education law are considered essential for Minnesota public school principals to know. Therefore, it is recommended that Minnesota public school districts assess and measure the education law knowledge of their current principals and administrators. The results of these assessments will provide school districts with critical information to identify the gaps in education law knowledge among their administrators.

2. This study also identified which areas of education law have an immediate need for continuing education. With this information, it is recommended that Minnesota public school districts develop plans to deliver the necessary education law continuing education to their principals and administrators.
3. The areas of education law which are deemed critical for inclusion, or to be given priority, in Minnesota principal licensure programs were also identified in this study. As a result, it is recommended that Minnesota colleges and universities that offer principal licensure programs, in collaboration with the Minnesota Board of School Administrators, review the findings of this study and align their education law course curriculum to include the areas found by this study to be critical for inclusion, or to be given priority.
4. This study also identified the avenues for continuing education considered most convenient and efficient for Minnesota public school principals to attain new education law knowledge. Therefore, it is recommended that Minnesota public school districts review the findings of this study in order to develop education law trainings that meet the needs of their administrators in terms of convenience and efficiency.

Recommendations for Academics

The following recommendations are made for academics:

1. Given the continuous change to state and federal education law, and case law, this study should be repeated every five to seven years to ascertain new and updated perceptions of Minnesota public school principals, superintendents, and school district attorneys regarding education law.
2. This study revealed differences between areas of education law deemed essential for Minnesota public school principals to know, and those deemed critical for inclusion, or to be to be given priority, in Minnesota principal licensure programs. Therefore, it is recommended that a study be undertaken to determine the reason(s) for these differences.
3. Given that Minnesota public school principals and administrators operate under school board policy, it is recommended that a study be conducted to measure Minnesota public school administrators' knowledge of their school board policy.
4. A study should be conducted to measure the differences in perceptions and knowledge of Minnesota public school administrators regarding education law based upon their grade level assignment (elementary, middle, or high school) and district student enrollment size.
5. To achieve a stronger response rate, it is recommended that future studies involving the population of Minnesota public school principals and superintendents seek group events, such as MASSP or MESPA conferences, to have respondents complete the survey.

Concluding Comments

Minnesota public school principals and administrators must know education law. In addition, they must be kept regularly updated on the changes made to education law, be it at the state or federal level, or by court decisions at any level. To achieve this end, the required education law course(s) within Minnesota principal licensure programs must deliver the most relevant and critical education law information to their students. Moreover, Minnesota public school districts must build the capacity and develop the means to provide continuing education to their administrators on a regular basis which provides education law updates in the most convenient and efficient manner. Using the findings of this study, Minnesota public school principals and administrators can become better equipped to know, make decisions, and act according to education law as they strive to develop and lead their respective schools that deliver the strongest academic experience for their students and families.

References

- Alexander, K., & Alexander, M. D. (2001). *American public school law*. (5th ed.). Belmont, CA: Thomson Learning.
- Alexander, K., & Alexander, M. D. (2005). *American public school law*. (6th ed.). Belmont, CA: Thomson Learning.
- Alexander, K., & Alexander, M. D. (2009). *American public school law*. (7th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.
- Apling, R. N., Jones, N. L., & Smole, D. P. (2004). *Individuals with disabilities education act (IDEA): Background and issues*. Hauppauge, NY: Nova Science Publishers, Inc.
- Armenta, T. (1999). Using the internet to stay current in school law. *NASSP Bulletin*, 83(607), 21-25.
- Arnberger, K., & Shoop, R. (2006). A principal's guide to manifestation determination. *Principal Leadership*, 6(9), 16-21.
- Bain, C. (2009). Untangling legal issues that affect teachers and student teachers. *Art Education*, 62(5), 47-53.
- Balch, B. V., Hofmeister, D. R. & Memory, D. M. (2008). Teachers and the law: Application essentials, general considerations, and specific examples. *Clearing House: A Journal of Educational Strategies, Issues and Ideas*, 82(1), 5-9.
- Baruch, Y. (1999). Response rate in academic studies – A comparative analysis. *Human Relations*, 52, 421-38.

- Baruch, Y., & Holtom, B. C. (2008). Survey response rate levels and trends in organizational research. *Human Relations*, 61(8), 1139-1160. Retrieved from <http://hum.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/61/8/1139>
- Baule, S. M., & Kriha, D. L. (2008). Free speech in a MySpace world. *Library Media Connection*, 26(5), 22-24.
- Benson, K.M. (2005). United States Supreme Court decisions that have shaped K-12 education in America, 1972-2004. *Dissertation Abstracts International* 66(06), 2032A. (UMI No. 3180758).
- Bethel School District v. Fraser, 478 U.S. 675 (1986).
- Brabrand, S. S. (2003). Virginia principals and school law. Doctoral Dissertation, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 64 (06A), 96-1914.
- Braun, W. J. & Maindonald, J. (2010). *Data analysis and graphics using R: An example-based approach*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.
- Brooks, J. S., Gomez, J. & McNamara, P. (2006). But it all happened online – Where do we stand as a school?: Student rights in noninstructional matters. *Journal of Cases in Educational Leadership*, 9(1), 35-43.
- Brown v. Board of Education, 347 U.S. 483 (1954).
- Buckman, D. T. & Wood, R.C. (2001). If school web sites are not accessible to all students, lawsuits are inevitable. *Your School and the Law*, 31(7), 1-3.

- Caldwell, T. M. (1986). Virginia principals and school law. Doctoral Dissertation, Virginia Polytechnic and State University. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 48(05), 1067A.
- Cambron-McCabe, N. H., McCarthy, M. M., & Thomas, S. B. (2004). *Public school law*. (5th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Chase, M. A. & Dummer, G. M. (1992). The role of sports as a social determinant for children. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 63, 418-424.
- Coeyman, M. (2003). Are schools more afraid of lawsuits than they should be?: An education-law expert says the perception that schools are under siege from courts isn't the case. *The Christian Science Monitor*. Retrieved from <http://www.csmonitor.com/2003/0527/p21s01-lepr.html>
- Copenhaver, M. B. (2005). Survey of North Carolina principals' knowledge of special education law. Purdue University. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 66 (08A), 172-2889.
- Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications
- Crockett, C. W. (1994). A survey of Alabama principals' perceived comfort levels regarding their legal knowledge of students rights in the areas of constitutional law, torts, and special education. The University of Alabama. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 56 (03A), 112-772.
- Cycyota, C. S. & Harrison, D. A. (2006). What (not) to expect when surveying executives. *Organizational Research Methods*, 9, 133-60.

- Daresh, J. C. (1997). Improving principal preparation: A review of common strategies. *NASSP Bulletin*, 81(585), 3.
- Davidson, D. N. (1999). Perceptions and knowledge of special education law among principal fellows in North Carolina. The University of North Carolina at Charlotte. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 60 (06A), 171-1843.
- Dickinson, M. C., & Miller, T. L. (2006). Issues regarding in-school suspensions and high school students with disabilities. *American Secondary Education*, 35(1), 72-83.
- Doverspike, D. E. (1990). The principal, students, and the law. The University of Akron. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 51 (05A), 1087-1456.
- Draa, V. B., & Sydney, T. D. (2009). Cyberbullying: Challenges and actions. *Journal of Family and Consumer Sciences*, 101(4), 40-46.
- Dunklee, D. R. (1985). An assessment of knowledge about tort liability as possessed by selected public school teachers and principals (negligence, duty, care, litigation, claims). Kansas State University. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 47 (01A), 210-33.
- Dunklee, D. R. & Shoop, R. J. (1992). *School law for the principal: A handbook for practioners*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Eberwein, H. J., III. (2008). Raising legal literacy in public schools, a call for principal leadership: A national study of secondary school principals' knowledge of public school law. University of Massachusetts Amherst. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 69 (09A), 281-3404.

- Eberwein, H. J., Militello, M. & Schimmel, D. (2009). If they knew, they would change: How legal knowledge impacts principals' practice. *NASSP Bulletin*, 93(1), 27-52.
- Engel v. Vitale, 370 U.S. 421 (1962).
- Essex, N.L. (2008). *School law and the public schools: A practical guide for educational leaders*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Fenton-O'Creevy, M. (1996). Employee involvement and the middle manager. Unpublished dissertation. London Business School.
- Foldesy, G., & King, D. (1995). Strip search in schools: Beyond the boundaries of the law? *Clearing House*, 68(5), 275-277.
- Gajda, R. (2008). States' expectations for teachers' knowledge about school law. *Action in Teacher Education*, 30(2), 15-24.
- Gavitt, D. R., Perks, D. J., & Olivo, J. J. (1997). Do you have an internet acceptable use policy? *Computers & Education*, 29(4), 147-151.
- Goals 2000: Educate America Act, H.R. 1804, 103d Cong., 2nd Sess. (1994).
- Gray, N., Herlihy, B., & McCollum, V. (2002). Legal and ethical issues in school counselor supervision. *Professional School Counseling*, 6(1), 55-60.
- Gullatt, D. E., & Tollett, J. R. (1997). Educational law: A requisite course for preservice and inservice teacher education programs. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 48(2), 129-135.

- Gutierrez, K. J., & Rossow, L. F. (2009). The U.S. Supreme Court speaks on voluntary school integration plans: Policy and practice implications for educational leaders. *NASSP Bulletin*, 93(1), 53-72.
- Harris, J.C. (2001). An inquiry into problematic K-12 public school law issues within the state of Florida. *Dissertation Abstracts International* 62(01), 0037A.
- Hazelwood School District et al. v. Kuhlmeier et al., 484 U.S. 260 (1988).
- Hingham, R., Littleton, M., & Styron, K. (2001). Education law preparation of school administrators: Legal knowledge of school officials. Paper presented at the Education Law Association annual conference, Albuquerque, NM.
- Hermann, M. A. (2002). A study of legal issues encountered by school counselors and perceptions of their preparedness to respond to legal challenges. *Professional School Counseling*, 6(1), 12-19.
- Hirth, M. A. (1988). Principals' knowledge of public law 94-142 and significant court litigation in the area of special education. Memphis State University. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 49 (12A), 155-3569.
- Hogan, J.C. (1985). *The schools, the courts, and the public interest*. Lexington, KY: Lexington Books.
- Hoover, C.G. (1998). The "Hazelwood" decision: A decade later. *NASSP Bulletin*, 82(599), 48-56.
- Hoyle, J.R. (2007). Educational leadership preparation programs lacking in quality? *Bunk! School Leadership News: The Newsletter of AERA Division A: Administration, Organization, & Leadership*, 19, 3-4.

- Hulsizer, D. (1987) Public education on trial. *Educational Leadership*, 8(5), 15-17.
- Joyce, S. R. (1982). The school district attorney: Trends of legal involvement in education. *NOLPE School Law Journal*, 10(2), 193-200.
- Kerrigan, J. (1987). A study of the perceptions of school administrators regarding education law, legal policies, and procedures. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 48(09), 2208A.
- Lamkin, M. L. (2006). Challenges and changes faced by rural superintendents. *Rural Educator*, 28(1), 17-24.
- Levine, A. (2005). Educating school leaders. *The Education Schools Project*. Retrieved from <http://www.edschools.org>
- Magone, M. A. (2007). Education law priorities and need: A comparative analysis. University of Montana. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 68 (04A), 279-1255.
- Mata, W.F. (1998). The knowledge level of Pennsylvania public school principals regarding the legal requirements for summative teacher evaluation. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 60(01), 36.
- Mawdsley, R. D., & Permuth, S. (2001). The Supreme Court of Education: Five Defining Cases. *Principal Leadership*, 1(8), 29-33.
- Minnesota Board of School Administrators. (2011). Minnesota administrator rules: 3512.0510 Program requirements for all administrative licenses. Retrieved from <https://www.revisor.mn.gov/rules/?id=3512.0510>

- Minnesota Office of the Revisor of Statutes. (2013). 2012 Minnesota Statutes: Table of chapters, 120 to 129B. Retrieved from <https://www.revisor.mn.gov/statutes/?view=part&start=120&close=129B>
- Minnesota Office of the Revisor of Statutes. (2013). Corporal Punishment. Retrieved from <https://www.revisor.mn.gov/statutes/?id=121a.58>
- Minnesota Office of the Revisor of Statutes. (2013). Department of Education. Retrieved from <https://www.revisor.mn.gov/rules/?agency=129>
- Minnesota State Department of Education. (1968). *A history of the state department of education in Minnesota*. St. Paul, MN: State Department of Education.
- Militello, M. (2006). The principal shortage in Massachusetts: Discerning the need between credentialed candidates and qualified candidates. Paper presented at the University Council for Educational Administrators, San Antonio, TX.
- Morse v. Frederick, 551 U.S. 393 (2007).
- Moswela, B. (2008). Knowledge of educational law: An imperative to the teacher's practice. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, 27(1), 93-105.
- Mounts, D. (1998). *Student teachers and legal issues*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.
- Newton, J. (2007). *Justice for all: Earl Warren and the nation he made*. New York, NY: Riverhead Trade.

- Noffke, J. & Underwood, J. (1990). Good news: The litigation scales are tipping in your favor. *Executive Policy*, 7(2), 257-279.
- No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, H.R. 1, 107th Cong., 1st Sess. (2002).
- Nwanne, A. I. (1986). The perceptions of public school principals in the state of Texas concerning selected court decisions. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 47(08), 2834A.
- Obama, B. (2008). *Change we can believe in. Barack Obama's plan to renew America's promise*. New York, NY: Three Rivers Press.
- Osborn, C. E. (1990). Principals' knowledge of South Dakota school law. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 51(06), 1859A.
- Patterson, F., & Rossow, L. (1996). Preventative law by the ounce or by the pound: Education law courses in undergraduate teacher education programs. *National Forum of Applied Educational Research Journal* 9(2), 38-43.
- Permeth, S. (1998). The principal and the issue of negligence. *NASSP Bulletin*, 82(599), 42-47.
- Petzko, V. N. (2001). Preventing legal headaches. *Principal Leadership*, 1(8), 34.
- Power, D. M. (2007). A study of selected Virginia school principals' knowledge of special education law. Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University; 0247 Advisor: Advisers David Alexander Jimmie Fortune). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 70 (02A), 129-533.
- Protz, B. M. (2005). Administrators' understanding of special education law in the schoolhouse. *Journal of Special Education Leadership*, 18(2), 15-23.

- Quinn, D. M. (2003). Legal issues in educational technology: Implications for school leaders. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 39(2), 187-207.
- Ravitch, D. (2000). *Left back: A century of failed school reforms*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.
- Reglin, G. L. (1992). Public school educators' knowledge of selected Supreme Court decisions affecting daily public school operations. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 30(9), 26-31.
- Rehabilitation Act of 1973, H.R. 8070, 93d Cong., 1st Sess. (1973).
- Ricci, E. A. (1997). Methods, issues and trends in the teaching of education law: A brief survey on the course syllabi. *NOLPE Notes*, 32(6).
- Richardson, S.N. & Zirkel, P.A. (1989). The “explosion” in education litigation. *West's Education Law Reporter* 53(3), 767-791.
- Rogelberg, S. & Stanton, J. (2007). Understanding and dealing with organizational survey non-response. *Organizational Research Methods*, 10, 195-209.
- Russo, C. J. (2006). *Reutter's the law of public education* (6th ed.). New York, NY: Foundation Press.
- Sametz, L. (1983). Teacher certification programs should require knowledge of children and the law. *Contemporary Education*, 54(4), 263-266.
- Schlosser, R. A. (2006). An analysis of principal interns' legal knowledge and legal instruction in principal preparation programs. Sam Houston State University. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 67 (09A), 205-3257.

- Schmidt, D. M. (1987). Illinois school administrators' knowledge of special education laws and regulations. Northern Illinois University. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 48 (07A), 237-1614.
- Shaw, F. W. (1983). Principals' knowledge of the law of public education and its relationship to their job satisfaction. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 44(10), 2947A.
- Smith, C. L. (2010). A quantitative analysis of Arkansas principals' knowledge of school law. Fayetteville, AR: University of Arkansas.
- Smith, G. J. (1988). *A comparison of Ohio secondary administrators knowledge, attitudes and principal-reported behavior as related to student rights law*. Toledo, OH: University of Toledo.
- Sparkman, W. E. (1990). Schools and the law: A basic foundation for administrators. *NASSP Bulletin*, 74(529), 59-64.
- Steeh, C. G. (1981). Trends in nonresponse rates, 1952-1979. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 45, 40-57.
- Stewart, D. (1998). Legalization of education: Implications for principals' professional knowledge. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 36(2), 129-145.
- Taylor, K., Esq. (2010). Case law. *Principal Leadership*, 10(5), 8.
- Taylor, K. R. (2003). Primary lessons. *Principal Leadership*, 3(9), 66.
- Tinker v. Des Moines Independent Community School District, 393 U.S. 503 (1969).
U.S. Const. amend. X.

- Valadez, L. (2005). An analysis of legal services and training of selected Texas school districts: Proactive vs. reactive approaches. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 66(10), ____.
- Valente, W. (1994). *Law in the schools*. New York, NY: Merrill.
- Walsh, M. (2001). School leaders tested on legal knowledge. *Education Week*, 21(13), 12.
- Ware, S. (2006). *Title IX: A brief history with documents*. New York, NY: Bedford-St. Martin's.
- Williams, P. (1994). Saying things about students: The legal implications for educators. *The Practicing Administrator*, 16(4), 4-6.
- Williams, R. E. (2005). California middle school principals' comfort level with the law. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 66(01), 0052A.
- Williams, W. H. (1915). *Laws of Minnesota relating to the public school system including the state normal schools and the University of Minnesota*. Minneapolis, MN: Syndicate Printing Co.
- Yurek, S. R. (1996). About books – special education laws: Issues & implications for the '90s by Stephen B. Thomas and Charles J. Russo. *National Association of Secondary School Principals. NASSP Bulletin*, 80(577), 121.
- Zahler, W. R. (2001). What practitioners think principals should know about school law in North Carolina. The University of North Carolina at Charlotte. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 62 (09A), 115-2948.

Appendix A

Education Law Domains and Individual Areas

| Student Rights | Teacher and Employment Issues | Miscellaneous |
|--|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Search and Seizure • Freedom of Speech • Corporal Punishment • Suspensions/Expulsions • Drug Testing • Students with Infectious Disease • Harassment • FERPA/Privacy • Extra-Curricular Participation • Dress Codes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Equal Employment Opportunity • Drug Testing/Background Checks • Dismissal Procedures • Sexual Harassment • Leave Issues • Staff Evaluation • Privacy or Other Constitutional Rights • Educational Malpractice • Role of Police Liaison Officer • Employment Contracts • Collective Bargaining | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Historical/Foundational Legal Knowledge of Schools • Legal Research/Case Study Skills • Church and State • Ethics • Curriculum Accountability • School Finance • Safe/Healthy Learning Environment • Internet/Computer Usage • Section 1983 (Federal Tort-Constitutional Rights) Actions • Due Process for Students or Staff • Desegregation • School Property and Buildings • Home or Private School Issues • Residency Requirements • School Fees • Academic Sanctions for Students • Reporting Child Abuse • Public Access to School Facilities • Open Meeting/Public Records Law |

Appendix A (continued)

Education Law Domains and Individual Areas

| Academic Issues | Exceptional Children | Tort Liabilities |
|---|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student Testing/NCLB • Grading/Promotion • Education of EL Students • Copyright Law • Textbook Selection • Compulsory School Attendance • Censorship • School Attendance | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Americans with Disabilities Act • Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) • Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act • Student Rights • Parent Rights • Disciplining Handicapped Students • Extra-Curricular Participation | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Negligence • Extra-Curricular Activities/Athletic Programs • Proper Maintenance of Buildings/Grounds • Supervision of Students • Educational Malpractice • Field Trips • Student Transportation • Privacy Rights • Intentional Torts (assault, defamation, etc.) |

Appendix B

Education Law Survey – 2013

THANK YOU for your willingness to complete this survey. It includes 31 questions and consists of three parts: Demographics, Important Areas of Education Law, and Continuing Education for Principals. Some pages and questions in Part I are job-specific and not applicable to all respondents.

Estimated time for completion is roughly 15 minutes.

When you have finished, please click the "Next" arrow at the bottom-left corner of the survey.

Thank you very much!

PART I: DEMOGRAPHICS

1. Select the position in which you are currently employed.

- Superintendent
- Assistant Superintendent
- Principal
- Assistant Principal
- Attorney

2. Gender:

- Male
- Female

3. Ethnicity:

- American Indian
- Asian
- Hispanic
- Black
- White

4. Age range:

- Under 30
- 31-40
- 41-50
- 51-60
- 61 or over

5. Highest completed educational degree:

- Masters
- Educational Specialist
- Doctorate
- Other

6. Type of school district in which you are employed:

- Urban
- Suburban
- Rural

7. Total enrollment of your school district:

- 1,000 or fewer
- 1,001 – 5,000
- 5,001 - 10,000
- 10,000 or more

8. Total years you have worked in school administration:

- 1 - 5
- 6 - 10
- 11 - 15
- 16 - 20
- 21 - 25
- 26 or more

9. Total years you have worked in education:

- 1 - 5
- 6 - 10
- 11 - 15
- 16 - 20
- 21 - 25
- 26 or more

10. Number of graduate level education law courses you were required to take in your principal licensure program:

- 0
- 1
- 2
- 3 or more

This section (Q11 - Q13) is for Attorneys only.

11. Years of attorney practice:

- 1 - 5
- 6 - 10
- 11 or more

12. Years of education law-related practice:

- 1 - 5
- 6 - 10
- 11 or more

13. Current attorney position:

- Public organization or state agency attorney
- Private practice attorney
- Other

PART II: IMPORTANT AREAS OF EDUCATION LAW

Directions for Superintendents/Assistant Superintendents, Principals/Assistant Principals, and Education Law Attorneys:

Please provide your perceptions regarding areas of education law you that you believe are important for a Minnesota public school PRINCIPAL.

Please rate the specific education law topics by the following:

- a. Overall importance to Minnesota public school principals: Mark ESSENTIAL, IMPORTANT, or NOT IMPORTANT.
- b. A principal's immediate need for continuing education in the listed areas of education law. Indicate whether you think principals have an IMMEDIATE NEED for continuing education in that particular education law area. IMMEDIATE = needed within the next 12 months.
- c. Critical or noncritical importance for being taught in a graduate level principal preparation required education law course.

Please indicate whether the area is CRITICAL for inclusion in a required education law course. CRITICAL = absolutely necessary to a public school principal for a school's operation.

Survey Part II: Domain I - Student Rights

14. Indicate the level of importance of each of the following education law areas to Minnesota public school principals:

| | Essential | Important | Not Important |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Search and Seizure | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Freedom of Speech | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Corporal Punishment | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Suspensions/Expulsions | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Drug Testing | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Students with Infectious Disease | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Harassment | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| FERPA/Privacy | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Extra-Curricular Participation | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Dress Codes | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

15. Indicate a) whether the area of education law knowledge is of immediate need for a principal, and b) whether the area of law is critical for inclusion in an education law course within a principal licensure program. (You may check one or the other, both, or neither.)

"IMMEDIATELY NEEDED" = continuing education needed within the next 12 months.

"CRITICAL" = absolutely necessary to a public school principal for a school's operation.

| | Continuing education immediately needed for principals? | Critical for principal licensure program? |
|----------------------------------|---|---|
| Search and Seizure | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Freedom of Speech | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Corporal Punishment | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Suspensions/Expulsions | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Drug Testing | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Students with Infectious Disease | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Harassment | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| FERPA/Privacy | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Extra-Curricular Participation | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Dress Codes | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Survey Part II: Domain II - Teacher and Employment Issues

16. Indicate the level of importance of each of the following education law areas to Minnesota public school principals:

| | Essential | Important | Not Important |
|--|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Equal Employment Opportunity | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Drug Testing/Background Checks | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Dismissal Procedures | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Sexual Harassment | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Leave Issues | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Staff Evaluation | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Privacy or Other Constitutional Rights | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Educational Malpractice | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Role of Police Liaison Officer | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Employment Contracts | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Collective Bargaining | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

17. Indicate a) whether the area of education law knowledge is of immediate need for a principal, and b) whether the area of law is critical for inclusion in an education law course within a principal licensure program. (You may check one or the other, both, or neither.)

"IMMEDIATELY NEEDED" = continuing education needed within the next 12 months.

"CRITICAL" = absolutely necessary to a public school principal for a school's operation.

| | Continuing education immediately needed for principals? | Critical for principal licensure program? |
|--|---|---|
| Equal Employment Opportunity | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Drug Testing/Background Checks | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Dismissal Procedures | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Sexual Harassment | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Leave Issues | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Staff Evaluation | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Privacy or Other Constitutional Rights | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Educational Malpractice | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Role of Police Liaison Officer | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Employment Contracts | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Collective Bargaining | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Survey Part II: Domain III - Miscellaneous

18. Indicate the level of importance of each of the following education law areas to Minnesota public school principals:

| | Essential | Important | Not Important |
|---|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Historical/Foundational Legal Knowledge of Schools | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Legal Research/Case Study Skills | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Church and State Ethics | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Curriculum Accountability | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| School Finance | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Safe/Healthy Learning Environment | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Internet/Computer Usage | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Section 1983 (Federal Tort-Constitutional Rights) Actions | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Due Process for Students or Staff | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Desegregation | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| School Property and Buildings | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Home or Private School Issues | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Residency Requirements | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| School Fees | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Academic Sanctions for Students | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Reporting Child Abuse | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Public Access to School Facilities | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Open Meeting/Public Records Law | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

19. Indicate a) whether the area of education law knowledge is of immediate need for a principal, and b) whether the area of law is critical for inclusion in an education law course within a principal licensure program. (You may check one or the other, both, or neither.)

"IMMEDIATELY NEEDED" = continuing education needed within the next 12 months.

"CRITICAL" = absolutely necessary to a public school principal for a school's operation.

| | Continuing education immediately needed for principals? | Critical for principal licensure program? |
|---|---|---|
| Historical/Foundational Legal Knowledge of Schools | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Legal Research/Case Study Skills | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Church and State | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Ethics | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Curriculum Accountability | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| School Finance | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Safe/Healthy Learning Environment | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Internet/Computer Usage | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Section 1983 (Federal Tort-Constitutional Rights) Actions | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Due Process for Students or Staff | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Desegregation | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| School Property and Buildings | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Home or Private School Issues | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Residency Requirements | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| School Fees | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Academic Sanctions for Students | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Reporting Child Abuse | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Public Access to School Facilities | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Open Meeting/Public Records Law | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Survey Part II: Domain IV - Academic Issues

20. Indicate the level of importance of each of the following education law areas to Minnesota public school principals:

| | Essential | Important | Not Important |
|------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Student Testing/NCLB | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Grading/Promotion | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Education of EL Students | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Copyright Law | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Textbook Selection | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Compulsory School Attendance | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Censorship | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| School Attendance | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

21. Indicate a) whether the area of education law knowledge is of immediate need for a principal, and b) whether the area of law is critical for inclusion in an education law course within a principal licensure program. (You may check one or the other, both, or neither.)

"IMMEDIATELY NEEDED" = continuing education needed within the next 12 months.

"CRITICAL" = absolutely necessary to a public school principal for a school's operation.

| | Continuing education immediately needed for principals? | Critical for principal licensure program? |
|------------------------------|---|---|
| Student Testing/NCLB | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Grading/Promotion | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Education of EL Students | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Copyright Law | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Textbook Selection | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Compulsory School Attendance | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Censorship | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| School Attendance | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Survey Part II: Domain V - Exceptional Children

22. Indicate the level of importance of each of the following education law areas to Minnesota public school principals:

| | Essential | Important | Not Important |
|--|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Americans with Disabilities Act | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Student Rights | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Parent Rights | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Disciplining Handicapped Students | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Extra-Curricular Participation | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

23. Indicate a) whether the area of education law knowledge is of immediate need for a principal, and b) whether the area of law is critical for inclusion in an education law course within a principal licensure program. (You may check one or the other, both, or neither.)

"IMMEDIATELY NEEDED" = continuing education needed within the next 12 months.

"CRITICAL" = absolutely necessary to a public school principal for a school's operation.

| | Continuing education immediately needed for principals? | Critical for principal licensure program? |
|--|---|---|
| Americans with Disabilities Act | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Student Rights | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Parent Rights | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Disciplining Handicapped Students | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Extra-Curricular Participation | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Survey Part II: Domain VI - Tort Liabilities

24. Indicate the level of importance of each of the following education law areas to Minnesota public school principals:

| | Essential | Important | Not Important |
|---|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Negligence | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Extra-Curricular Activities/Athletic Programs | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Proper Maintenance of Buildings/Grounds | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Supervision of Students | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Educational Malpractice | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Field Trips | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Student Transportation | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Privacy Rights | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Intentional Torts (assault, defamation, etc.) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

25. Indicate a) whether the area of education law knowledge is of immediate need for a principal, and b) whether the area of law is critical for inclusion in an education law course within a principal licensure program. (You may check one or the other, both, or neither.)

"IMMEDIATELY NEEDED" = continuing education needed within the next 12 months.

"CRITICAL" = absolutely necessary to a public school principal for a school's operation.

| | Continuing education immediately needed for principals? | Critical for principal licensure program? |
|---|---|---|
| Negligence | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Extra-Curricular Activities/Athletic Programs | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Proper Maintenance of Buildings/Grounds | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Supervision of Students | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Educational Malpractice | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Field Trips | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Student Transportation | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Privacy Rights | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Intentional Torts (assault, defamation, etc.) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

26. List any other topics you feel need to be listed, noting whether they are a) essential for principals, b) immediately needed for principals, or c) critical for principal licensure programs:

PART III: CONTINUING EDUCATION FOR PRINCIPALS

Directions for Superintendents/Assistant Superintendents, Principals/Assistant Principals, and Education Law Attorneys: Please provide your perceptions regarding what a PRINCIPAL'S needs and preferences are for continuing education in education law.

27. Indicate what you believe is the level of CONVENIENCE of each of the following education law continuing education settings for public school principals: "CONVENIENCE" = fitting within an expected amount of time and/or cost.

| | High Convenience | Medium Convenience | Low Convenience |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| In-district training | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Regional workshops | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| State-level workshops | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Additional graduate-level coursework | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Video-conferencing or online format | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

28. Indicate what you believe is the level of EFFICIENCY for each of the following continuing education settings for public school principals: "EFFICIENCY" = meeting a principal's needs for gaining education law knowledge.

| | High Efficiency | Medium Efficiency | Low Efficiency |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| In-district training | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Regional workshops | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| State-level workshops | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Additional graduate-level coursework | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Video-conferencing or online format | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

29. Indicate the level of CONVENIENCE for principals to participate in each of the following time increments of additional continuing education opportunities: "CONVENIENCE" = fitting within an expected amount of time and/or cost.

| | High Convenience | Medium Convenience | Low Convenience |
|---|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Full-day education law training once during the school year | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Half-day education law training twice during the school year | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Series of two-hour education law trainings throughout the school year | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Full-day education law training once during the summer | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Half-day education law training twice during the summer | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

30. Indicate the level of EFFICIENCY for principals to participate in each of the following time increments of additional continuing education opportunities: "EFFICIENCY" = meeting a principal's needs for gaining education law knowledge.

| | High Efficiency | Medium Efficiency | Low Efficiency |
|---|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Full-day education law training once during the school year | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Half-day education law training twice during the school year | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Series of two-hour education law trainings throughout the school year | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Full-day education law training once during the summer | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Half-day education law training twice during the summer | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

31. Your comments, suggestions, and questions are welcomed and appreciated:

Appendix C

Education Law Survey Comments

26. List any other topics you feel need to be listed, noting whether they are a) essential for principals, b) immediately needed for principals, or c) critical for principal licensure programs:

| Question 26 Responses (verbatim) |
|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Cultural competence and equitable student achievement gains; SEL skills and PBIS, due process and LRE; strong decision making skills. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Special Education Law: Least Restrictive Environment, Manifest Determination, etc.- Critical for principal certification |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• updates in current legislation |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Class scheduling |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• medical care / LGBT / Virtual education |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• none |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The most important thing about Ed. Law is not knowing everything, but knowing enough to have a red flag go up when something happens. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• scheduling essential, seniority essential, human relations essential |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• cyber bullying |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Dealing with parents of different cultures - how to respond to accusations of racial discrimination. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Issues keep arising with social media. As the courts define this continued in service will be essential. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• I have found that in Minnesota principals are very deficit in knowing human resources procedures, documentation, writing letters to address expectations, discipline, etc. It amazes me that Minnesota allows principals to be certified without sharp skills in this area. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Essential- working with the media, appropriate use of social media in the school message, in licensure- the law and social media |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Law changes. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Inclusion models concerning students with special needs. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Bullying, common core, assessment practices, plc |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The caveat to your items are "immediately" & "critical". Every item you have requested opinions on are important for principals. Whether they are critical to the certification program, or need to be mentioned, is the issue. All of the topics need to be part of the program, but many are changing every year. Continuing Ed. is always important. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Social Media a/b |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• This probably falls under "parent rights," but principals should understand the basics of divorce decrees, custodial arrangements and restraining orders. |

Question 26 Responses, continued (verbatim)

- a, b, c) leadership and supervision skills; communication skills; understanding what it means to be an instructional leader and the difference that building leadership can make for student achievement
- I found nothing that I can say is "Immediately Essential" for all principals. They need a base level of law knowledge and then a protocol or process through which they consistently handle all situations. The immediate essential items would be an individualized event depending upon their personal expertise.
- Interviewing techniques
- School safety / accessibility
- building positive relationships-dealing with staff and students-personnel law
- Data tracking and submissions: c), Building a Master Schedule: a)
- MSHSL "Good Standing" and Participation
- cyber bullying and social media drama
- Issues related to technology use by staff and students, policy development, Staff mental health issues, Employee assistance programs
- understanding the language of various employee contracts including supervision and evaluation of all
- school culture
- Title I and Title II Program Requirements. MDE Required Reporting. Parental Involvement.
- open forums and limited open forums - essential
- Recent changes in special education law
- Documentation and Files
- Essential they better understand the Pupil Fair Dismissal Act and how to implement it
- Most all Legal Issues are a must!!!
- Social media issues - occurring in school AND outside of school
- Crisis intervention and student safety.
- Bullying (it should be it's own separate topic from harassment)
- Essential understanding of the new statute regarding teacher evaluation. The MDE model includes more than the law requires.
- Critical for principal certification would be dealing with IEP's and students with special needs.
- Social Media- Students and staff access

31. Your comments, suggestions, and questions are welcomed and appreciated:

Question 31 Responses (verbatim)

- As someone that has worked in a small and large school system. I believe that the principals in a smaller school system feel a greater need to be informed of educational law issues to a greater degree. In a large system, we have the opportunity to seek counsel from our attorney and seek support from special education coordinators and other department leads. In smaller systems, those options are not as readily available.
- There never seems to be a good time to get out of the building for this type of training. I recommend summer dates.
- I don't feel the need for any further training on school law. If I have questions, I would contact my assistant supt or supt.
- half day- hard to leave the district, video- depends on technology available- best part or live mtg,- sharing with colleagues
- We are outstate and rural. Getting to a workshop is usually a multiple-hour transport and inconvenient return to school.
- During the school year, because of work load it is difficult to leave the building.
- Summer is unpaid. There are enough unpaid obligations on administrators already.
- Good luck with your project. In my opinion, the top four areas in which a principal should have a good working legal knowledge are as follows: employee discipline procedures, data privacy rights, special education law, student discipline law.
- Most convenient are on site. Another more targeted convenience would be to have a video library of specific legal protocols that are categorized under the most common things they must deal with. It would be very helpful that all Principals could access this information on the day they need it to review exactly how they are handling the situation they are facing.
- Online webinars are the most efficient and convenient, and can often provide more info by using electronic handouts.
- We are a remote district currently without broadband.
- Some of the topics are essential to the preparation programs and a regular update is useful but whether the principal needed the update depends on how often she is confronted by the problems.
- convenience depends on location
- The two hour inservice would be Ok if offered through webinar or video conferencing that could be accessed at district.
- As a student working toward my doctorate in Ed. Leadership and currently taking a Legal Issues class (first law class since my principal's licensure classes in 2003), I realize how important it is to go over all law that educators might encounter on a yearly basis. I forgot a lot of important things over the course of 10 years.
- I feel it is better to be gone a full day rather than a half day. The importance of the day outweighs the impact of being out of the building.
- Nicely done survey. Timely topic.

Appendix D

Education Law Survey Email Introduction and Reminders

Greetings,

My name is Bart Becker, and I am conducting a research study entitled Minnesota Public School Principals and Education Law in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education at Bethel University.

I humbly request that you consider participating in my doctoral study to gather the perceptions of Minnesota principals regarding **education law**. The survey includes **31 questions** and is entirely voluntary, absolutely confidential, and is comprised of three parts: Demographic Information, Important Areas of Education Law for Principals, and Continuing Education for Principals. It takes approximately **15 minutes** to complete. Please see the attached informed consent document for additional information.

The purposes of the study are to identify:

1. the areas of education law considered essential for Minnesota public school principals to have know;
2. the areas of education law that Minnesota public school principals have the most immediate need of continuing education;
3. the areas of education law deemed critical for inclusion, or to be given priority, in Minnesota principal licensure programs; and,
4. the avenues considered most convenient and efficient for Minnesota public school principals to attain new knowledge of education law.

Your participation would be invaluable to my study, and I deeply appreciate your consideration of this request. In addition to this introductory email, two friendly reminders will be sent in the coming weeks.

To begin the survey, click on the following link: https://bethel.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_6yzo5A1wg7kHtrf

If you have any questions about this study, please do not hesitate to contact me at barton-becker@bethel.edu, or you can reach me on my cell at (XXX) XXX-XXXX.

Very respectfully,

Bart Becker
Doctoral Candidate – Bethel University

Greetings,

This is the first of two friendly reminders regarding my request for your participation in my doctoral study, which seeks to gather the perceptions of Minnesota public school principals, superintendents, and school district attorneys regarding **education law**. My sincere thanks to those of you who already taken the survey. It includes **31 questions** and takes approximately **15 minutes** to complete. It is comprised of three parts: Demographic Information, Important Areas of Education Law for Principals, and Continuing Education for Principals. Please see the attached informed consent form for additional information.

Please feel free to contact me directly with any questions at barton-becker@bethel.edu or on my cell at (XXX) XXX-XXXX.

To participate, click on this link: https://bethel.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_6yzo5A1wg7kHtrf

Very respectfully,

Bart Becker
Doctoral Candidate – Bethel University

Greetings,

This is the second and final reminder regarding my request for your participation in my doctoral study, which seeks to gather the perceptions of Minnesota public school principals, superintendents, and school district attorneys regarding **education law**. My sincere thanks to those of you who already taken the survey. It includes **31 questions** and takes approximately **15 minutes** to complete. It is comprised of three parts: Demographic Information, Important Areas of Education Law for Principals, and Continuing Education for Principals. Please see the attached informed consent form for additional information.

Please feel free to contact me directly with any questions at barton-becker@bethel.edu or on my cell at (XXX) XXX-XXXX.

To participate, click on this link: https://bethel.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_6yzo5A1wg7kHtrf

Very respectfully,

Bart Becker
Doctoral Candidate – Bethel University

Appendix E

IRB Informed Consent Form

My name is Bart Becker, and I am conducting a research study entitled Minnesota Public School Principals and Education Law in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education at Bethel University. I am requesting your assistance by participating in this study of Minnesota public school principals, superintendents, and school district attorneys and their respective perceptions of education law. You were selected as a potential participant in this study because you are currently a licensed principal, superintendent, or school district attorney within the state of Minnesota.

I hope to identify a) the areas of education law considered essential for Minnesota public school principals to know; b) the areas of education law that public school principals have the most immediate need for new knowledge; c) the areas of education law deemed critical for inclusion, or to be given priority, in Minnesota principal licensure programs; and, d) the avenues for continuing education considered most convenient and efficient for Minnesota public school principals to attain new knowledge of education law.

The results of this study will be shared with Bethel University's Doctoral Program of Educational Leadership, the Minnesota Association of Secondary School Principals, the Minnesota Elementary School Principals Association, and the Minnesota School Boards Association's Council of School Attorneys.

If you decide to participate, please click the link included in this email to begin the survey. It is estimated to take approximately 15 minutes to complete and is comprised of three parts:

1. **Demographic Information**, which asks participants for their demographic data including topics such as gender, current position, experience in education and administration, education level, education law coursework, school district enrollment size, and education law workshops;
2. **Important Areas of Education Law for Principals**, which asks participants about the importance of education law areas, the level of need for additional training in those areas, and which education law areas are critical for inclusion in education law coursework within principal licensure programs.
3. **Continuing Education for Principals**, which asks respondents several questions with the intention of identifying the most efficient avenue for Minnesota public school principals to receive continuing education on education law matters.

Your participation is entirely voluntary, however I am humbly requesting that you complete the survey as your participation is important to gathering accurate and

useful results which measure the perceptions of the population in order to improve education law opportunities for Minnesota public school principals.

It is my hope that the results of this study will add to the body of research and provide additional knowledge regarding Minnesota administrators' perceptions of education law. It is also hoped that principal licensure programs in Minnesota might utilize the findings of this study to enhance and strengthen their existing education law courses to meet the specific needs of would-be principals based on this current and up-to-date information. In addition, using the results of this study, school districts working independently or in collaboration with the Minnesota Department of Education can deliver education law updates in the most efficient manner to their current principals.

Should you choose to participate, your responses will be strictly confidential. In any written reports or publications, no one will be identified or identifiable and only the aggregate data will be presented. Your decision whether or not to participate will not affect your future relations with Bethel University in any way. If you choose to participate, you are free to discontinue participation at any time without affecting the relationship with Bethel University.

This study has been reviewed and approved in accordance with Bethel University's Levels of Review and Research with Humans. If you have any questions about the research and/or research participants' rights or wish to report a research-related injury, please call me on my cell at (XXX) XXX-XXXX, or you may also call Bethel University's Educational Doctorate Program Director, Dr. Craig Paulson, at (XXX) XXX-XXXX.

By completing and returning the survey, you are granting consent to participate in this research.

Appendix F

Permission from Michael Magone

-----Original Message-----

From: Bart Becker [<mailto:barton-becker@bethel.edu>]

Sent: Monday, June 27, 2011 1:28 PM

To: bonzo@bresnan.net; mikem@lolo.k12.mt.us

Subject: extending your study -

Greetings, Dr. Magone -

My name is Bart Becker and I am an administrator at suburban high school in the Twin Cities and will be a fourth-year doctoral student at Bethel University. I am originally from Montana and still proudly consider it my "home," though I have been living in Minnesota since 1998. You may know of my mother, Gail Becker, as she was a principal and assistant superintendent for Missoula County Public Schools until she retired a couple years ago.

I came across your dissertation while researching and am very interested in extending your study to the state of Minnesota. After teaching social studies for the better part of nine years, I accepted a position as a Behavior Intervention Teacher in 2009 and am now in my third year as an administrator - this experience has truly enlightened me of the critical importance of the need to know education law and having an efficient and resourceful system to continually update administrative teams on changes to existing laws. This year, for example, I had the unfortunate privilege of having to testify at an expulsion hearing and did a great deal of preparation to testify that we had entirely followed the law throughout our investigation. Thus, while searching for relevant sources on the topic, my search quickly led me to your dissertation.

With your permission, I would love to use your survey to measure and analyze the views of Minnesota administrators and school district general counsels regarding the education laws most critical for building principals to possess significant knowledge. A study like this has never been done in Minnesota and I believe would fit a critical need in identifying the laws and further, providing invaluable feedback by administrators regarding the most efficient manner in which they could receive additional training and updates on new laws and changes to existing laws.

Please feel free to contact me with any questions at this email address or call me on my cell - (XXX) XXX-XXXX. I thank you in advance for your time and consideration.

Regards,

Bart Becker

From: Michael Magone [bonzo@bresnan.net]
Sent: Monday, June 27, 2011 2:59 PM
To: Bart Becker; mikem@lolo.k12.mt.us
Subject: RE: extending your study -

Bart -

Thanks for your email! Please give my best to your mom - she was an outstanding administrator for MCPS and I have a lot of respect for her and all she did, as well as appreciate the various times she was able to help me out along the way.

You certainly have my permission to extend the survey/study into Minnesota - I am tickled that you would want to do so and that it might be of assistance elsewhere outside of Montana.

As an added note, if you do end up setting up school law trainings in the future, you might consider providing principals with their own training on one day, and then superintendents and principals on another day. In conducting trainings since the study results, we've found that having superintendents there with the principals doesn't allow for as much "free voice" and discussion from the principals.

Another thought - up until this last year we held an annual mid-school year meeting of the various school law attorneys, MT University system school law professors, and various other state agency/organization K-12 school-law related chief/heads to review K-12 school law training needs for administrators and how we might improve how it is provided. Was a great chance for us to collaborate and develop consistency instead of coming at it from three or four separate approaches since OPI, MTSBA, SAM, private school law attorneys and UM/MSU all provide various types of school law training to administrators and teachers.

In any case, good luck with your work and please feel free to call if I can be of any assistance. My cell is (XXX) XXX-XXXX. Again, I am honored that my work may be able to help you folks out in some fashion or another. Beats the heck out of it just collecting dust on a shelf! :)

I'll let UM's Dean, Roberta Evans, know of your interest as well. As my dissertation chair she was an invaluable resource/support for me when I was developing the study and writing the dissertation.

Best regards from Missoula -

M Magone