

Spring 2008

General Secondary School Principals' and Athletic Directors' Experiences Regarding the Priority of Selected Athletic Department Tasks and the Time Required to Accomplish Them

Charles Arthur Denney
Georgia Southern University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/etd>

Recommended Citation

Denney, Charles Arthur, "General Secondary School Principals' and Athletic Directors' Experiences Regarding the Priority of Selected Athletic Department Tasks and the Time Required to Accomplish Them" (2008). *Electronic Theses & Dissertations*. 309.
<https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/etd/309>

This dissertation (open access) is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate Studies, Jack N. Averitt College of at Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses & Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@georgiasouthern.edu.

GEORGIA SECONDARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS' AND ATHLETIC DIRECTORS'
EXPERIENCES REGARDING THE PRIORITY OF SELECTED ATHLETIC
DEPARTMENT TASKS AND THE TIME REQUIRED TO ACCOMPLISH THEM

by

CHARLES ARTHUR DENNEY

(Under the Direction of Abebayehu Tekleselassie)

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to discover the relationship between principals' experiences and athletic directors' experiences related to selected athletic department tasks. The overarching research question was: To what extent do principals' responses and athletic directors' responses differ concerning athletic department tasks? This question was investigated by comparing the priority given to each task by the principals and the athletic directors; by evaluating the rank order of each task as given by each group; by contrasting the differences in the start date as indicated for each task by the principals and athletic directors; and by viewing, side-by-side, the number of days allocated for each task by each group.

The population for this study was the principals and athletic directors of the 402 schools in the Georgia High School Association (GHSA). A purposive random sample of 100 principals and the athletic directors who work with those principals was selected from the GHSA member schools. A researcher created survey was mailed to the sample group.

Analysis of the data showed a significant difference for two survey items in the area of priority: scheduling referees and creating eligibility lists. There was no significant difference between the responses for the amount of time allocated to the tasks. One cause for the lack of significance between the two sets of responses could be that 68% of the principals who participated in the study had coaching experience.

Recommendations were made in the areas of practice, preparation, and potential studies. Concerning practice, principals might find the results of this study useful in evaluating and in mentoring athletic directors. Athletic directors, on the other hand, could use the findings to accomplish tasks on time and to train aspiring athletic directors. Principal preparation programs might do well to include exposure to the athletic program in school management courses. Principals and athletic directors from other regions of the country could be interviewed to see if any significant differences exist between their experiences.

The *Guide to Athletic Department Task Management* was created from the responses given by the athletic directors.

INDEX WORDS: Principal Responsibilities, Athletic Director Responsibilities, Athletic Department Tasks, Athletic Department Task Management, Athletic Department Time Management

GEORGIA SECONDARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS' AND ATHLETIC DIRECTORS'
EXPERIENCES REGARDING THE PRIORITY OF SELECTED ATHLETIC
DEPARTMENT TASKS AND THE TIME REQUIRED TO ACCOMPLISH THEM

by

CHARLES ARTHUR DENNEY

B. S., Tennessee Temple College, 1977

M. S., Georgia State University, 1985

Ed. S., Augusta State University, 2005

A Dissertation Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of Georgia Southern University in
Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

STATESBORO, GEORGIA

2008

© 2008

Charles Arthur Denney

All Rights Reserved

GEORGIA SECONDARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS' AND ATHLETIC DIRECTORS'
EXPERIENCES REGARDING THE PRIORITY OF SELECTED ATHLETIC
DEPARTMENT TASKS AND THE TIME REQUIRED TO ACCOMPLISH THEM

by

CHARLES ARTHUR DENNEY

Major Professor: Abebayehu Tekleselassie

Committee: Paul Brinson
Samuel B. Hardy, III

Electronic Version Approved:
May 2008

DEDICATION

This document is dedicated to:

- Jesus Christ: my life, “I have died, but Christ lives in me. And I now live by faith in the Son of God, who loved me and gave his life for me” (Galatians 2:20 Contemporary English Version), and the source of strength in my life, “I have strength for all things in Christ Who empowers me” (Philippians 4:13a Amplified Bible).
- Willis Wayne Denney (May 23, 1932 – January 10, 1988), my father. He hated school, but he made sure I went.
- Gwen S. Denney, my mother. She has shown me how to be a life long learner.
- Terese W. Denney, my wife. She encouraged and supported me during this *paper chase*. “The right word spoken at the right time is as beautiful as gold apples in a silver bowl” (Proverbs 25:11 New Century Version).

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank Dr. Abebayehu Tekleselassie, Dr. Paul Brinson, and Dr. Sam Hardy for their tireless efforts in bringing this document to fruition. Also, I would like to thank the athletic directors of Richmond County's middle schools for piloting the survey; and the principals and athletic directors of the Georgia High School Association member schools who participated in the study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	7
LIST OF TABLES	11
CHAPTER	
I INTRODUCTION.....	13
Statement of the Problem.....	15
Significance.....	15
Autobiographical Roots of the Study	16
Research Questions	16
Procedures.....	17
Limitations	18
Summary.....	20
II REVIEW OF RESEARCH LITERATURE	21
Principals' Responsibilities and Roles	21
Why Study Athletic Department Tasks?	25
Athletic Directors' Responsibilities and Roles	26
Making the Connection Between Principals and Athletic Directors.....	27
Summary.....	29
III METHODOLOGY.....	31
Research Question	31
Population.....	32
Sample Population.....	32

	Instrument.....	33
	Reliability.....	34
	Data Collection.....	34
	Data Analysis	36
	Summary.....	38
IV	REPORT OF DATA AND DATA ANALYSIS.....	39
	Demographic Data of Principals	39
	Demographic Data of Athletic Directors.....	43
	Relationship Between Groups' Responses	46
	Survey Questions and Results.....	48
	Principals' Comments.....	65
	Athletic Directors' Comments	67
	Summary.....	68
V	SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	69
	Summary.....	69
	Discussion.....	74
	Conclusions.....	75
	Recommendations	77
	Closing Remarks	82
	REFERENCES	83
	APPENDICES	90
A	RESPONSIBILITIES AND ROLES OF PRINCIPALS.....	91

B	RESPONSIBILITIES AND ROLES OF ATHLETIC DIRECTORS.....	98
C	ATHLETIC DEPARTMENT TASK MANAGEMENT SURVEY	106
D	PRINCIPALS' COVER LETTER	112
E	REVISED PRINCIPALS' SURVEY	114
F	REVISED ATHLETIC DIRECTORS' SURVEY	119
G	GUIDE TO ATHLETIC DEPARTMENT TASK MANAGEMENT	124
H	FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS FOR PRINCIPALS	128
I	FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS FOR ATHLETIC DIRECTORS.....	131

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 1: Principals' Age and Gender	40
Table 2: Principals' Career Experience.....	41
Table 3: Principals' Returned Surveys.....	42
Table 4: Athletic Directors' Age and Gender.....	43
Table 5: Athletic Directors' Career Experience.....	44
Table 6: Athletic Directors' Returned Surveys.....	45
Table 7: The Number of Principals Who Provided Dates Compared With the Number of Athletic Directors Who Provided Dates	46
Table 8: The Number of Principals With Coaching Experience Who Provided Responses Compared With the Number of Principals Without Coaching Experience Who Provided Responses	47
Table 9: Survey Question One: Priority For Creating A Budget.....	48
Table 10: Survey Question Two: Priority For Ordering Equipment	49
Table 11: Survey Question Three: Priority For Scheduling Athletic Contests	49
Table 12: Survey Question Four: Priority For Obtaining Game Contracts.....	50
Table 13: Survey Question Five: Priority For Scheduling Referees.....	50
Table 14: Survey Question Six: Priority For Scheduling Contest Transportation	51
Table 15: Survey Question Seven: Priority For Eligibility Lists.....	52
Table 16: Survey Question Eight: Priority For Evaluating Coaches	52
Table 17: Survey Question Nine: Priority For Scheduling Practice Facilities.....	53

Table 18: Survey Question Ten: Priority For Notifying Students and Parents of Physical	54
Table 19: Principals' Rank Order of Tasks and the Athletic Directors' Rank Order Of Tasks.....	55
Table 20: Survey Question One: Days Indicated For The Task Of Creating A Budget...	56
Table 21: Survey Question Two: Days Indicated For Ordering Equipment.....	57
Table 22: Survey Question Three: Days Indicated For Scheduling Athletic Contests.....	57
Table 23: Survey Question Four: Days Indicated For Obtaining Game Contracts	58
Table 24: Survey Question Five: Days Indicated For Scheduling Referees	59
Table 25: Survey Question Six: Days Indicated For Scheduling Contest Transportation.....	60
Table 26: Survey Question Seven: Days Indicated For Eligibility Lists	60
Table 27: Survey Question Eight: Days Indicated For Evaluating Coaches.....	61
Table 28: Survey Question Nine: Days Indicated For Scheduling Practice Facilities.....	62
Table 29: Survey Question Ten: Days Indicated For Notifying Students And Parents Of Physicals	62
Table 30: Rank Order of Number of Days Allotted to Each Task by the Principals as Compared to the Rank Order of the Number of Days Allotted to Each Task by the Athletic Directors	64

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Traditionally, principals have been responsible for all aspects of the operation of their schools (Geocaris, 2004 and Weiner, 1979). Bouillette (1996) and Henderson (2002) stated that principals must both manage the tasks and lead the people involved in the education process. The responsibilities and roles of high school principals have been many and varied (Bouillette, 1996), and these responsibilities and roles have been in a state of flux (Kelly, 2003). Principals' roles have changed over the years from managers to instructional leaders (Geocaris, 2004). A few of a principal's management responsibilities have been: "total operation of the school" (Weiner, p. vii), "selecting and supervising the staff" (Kelly, p. 43), and "time management" (Geocaris, p. vii). High school principals have provided leadership in the fields of: "curriculum and instruction, personnel duties, school-community relations, management, and leadership" (Henderson, p. vii). Whether they are considered to be leaders or they are considered to be managers, principals must supervise the various departments in their school (Kelly). Boyd (2002), Yarborough (2002), Hughes (2006), and Colson (2007) added new responsibilities to the already long list of a principal's responsibilities. Boyd pointed out that principals of charter and magnet schools must become familiar with marketing their school; Yarborough addressed the role played by the principal in the process of including special needs students into the general educational setting; Hughes added the concept of the principal serving as the catalyst for developing and maintaining an ethical school; and Colson investigated mentoring and its impact on teacher retention.

At the national level there have been two instruments that set forth a principal's job responsibilities. The Council of Chief State School Officers' Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium's (ISLLC) *Standards for School Leaders* (1996) were designed as a measuring tool for principals. The National Policy Board for Educational Administration's Educational Leadership Constituent Council's (ELCC) *Standards for Advanced Programs in Educational Leadership* (2002) detailed the critical skills educational leaders should acquire during their formal education. States and counties have job responsibilities for principals as well.

The empirical studies, national standards, state job descriptions, and county job descriptions included observation, evaluation, and the development of professional improvement plans as a principal's responsibility. Anderson (1999) pointed out that many principals of Class B high schools in South Dakota (the smallest high schools in the state) served as the school's athletic director. Plutko (2002) stated that principals have little or no background in athletics.

Along with little or no background in athletics, principals have had no guidelines to use when evaluating an athletic director's time management skills or to reference when establishing a professional improvement plan for an athletic director. After an intensive investigation, this researcher found that Jones' (1988) study was the only empirical study that addressed the amount of time athletic directors spent on their varied tasks. Basting's (1990) study on the role expectations of athletic directors asked the respondents to estimate the percentage of time spent on various athletic department tasks. Basting suggested, "Athletic directors need to reassess the time spent on various functions which

are part of the responsibilities of the position” (p. 107). Jones recommended a study of the actual amount of time required to complete selected athletic department tasks.

Because the principal must evaluate the athletic director, and because part of that evaluation involves time management, principals should know not only what an athletic director’s duties are, they should also know how long it takes to complete those duties (Plutko, 2002 and Jones, 1988).

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study was to discover the relationship between principals’ experiences and athletic directors’ experiences in the areas of the priority of selected athletic department tasks, to determine the time required to accomplish those athletic department tasks, and to develop a guide to athletic department task management based on the responses given by the athletic directors who participated in the study.

Significance

Plutko’s (2002) study demonstrated that many principals have no athletic background, and Epps (1991) reminded his readers that the building principal is the official athletic liaison between the school and the National Federation of High Schools (NFHS). As indicated by Epps, the principal must sign off on all documents (eligibility forms, schedules, and/or rosters) sent to the state athletic association. Weiner (1979), Bouillette (1996), Henderson (2002), and Kelly (2003) all mentioned that supervision and evaluation were responsibilities of a principal. The results of this study will be useful to both principals and athletic directors. Principals will find the information gained through this study useful in creating professional improvement plans for their athletic directors, when needed.

Autobiographical Roots of the Study

The personal significance of this study lies in the fact that as an athletic director this researcher was often late or fighting a deadline for one or more tasks. This lateness created a great deal of frustration both within the researcher and between the researcher and the school's staff. If this researcher is able to discover, via the responses from the athletic directors on the study's survey, the amount of time required to start and to complete selected athletic department tasks, then this researcher will feel that the exercise was worth the effort.

Research Questions

The overarching research question was: To what extent do principals' responses and athletic directors' responses differ concerning athletic department tasks?

The sub-questions were:

1. How do principals' responses and athletic directors' responses vary in prioritizing selected athletic department tasks?
2. How does the principals' rank order of selected athletic department tasks and the athletic directors' rank order of selected athletic department tasks differ?
3. How do principals' responses and athletic directors' responses vary in the assessment of the start date and the end date of selected athletic department tasks?
4. How does the principals' number of days allotted for completing selected athletic department tasks differ from the athletic directors' number of days allotted for completing selected athletic department tasks?

Procedures

This researcher developed a quantitative survey designed to determine if there was a difference between principals' and athletic directors' priority of selected athletic department tasks, and if there was a difference in their understanding of the time required to complete selected athletic department tasks. The selected tasks were taken from various studies and from this researcher's professional experience.

Middle school athletic directors in Richmond County, Georgia, were asked to complete the survey in order to test the reliability of the researcher-designed survey. Revisions to the survey were made as needed.

The population for this study was the principals and athletic directors of the 402 schools in the Georgia High School Association (GHSA). A purposive random sample of 100 principals and the athletic directors who work with those principals was selected from the GHSA member schools. There were five divisions in the GHSA (A to AAAAA with A being the smallest classification and AAAAA being the largest classification); therefore, 20 principal and athletic director pairs were randomly selected from each division. The 20 random numbers for each section were generated using Urbaniak's and Plous' (2007) on-line random generator.

The principals' answers and the athletic directors' answers concerning the priority of selected athletic department tasks were analyzed via a *t*-test to determine if there was any significant difference ($p < .05$) between the answers of the two groups. A *t*-test measures the difference in the squares of the sample means (Sprinthall, 2003).

$$t = \frac{(M_1 - M_2) - \mu_{M_1 - M_2}}{SE_D}$$

The tasks were placed in rank order based on the mean of each group's priority.

The principals' answers and the athletic directors' answers concerning the amount of time required to accomplish selected athletic department tasks were analyzed via a *t*-test to determine if there was any significant difference ($p < .05$) between the answers of the two groups. The number of days allotted to each task was determined from each group's mean start date and mean end date. The tasks were placed in rank order according to the mean of the days allotted to the task by each group. All data analysis was conducted with the on-line data analysis program GraphPad (Motulsky, 2004).

Limitations

Extensive investigation revealed no studies which addressed the actual amount of time spent by athletic directors on athletic department tasks. There were many documents detailing athletic directors' roles and responsibilities and the roles and responsibilities of principals as they relate to the athletic department; therefore, the literature review focused on these documents. Of the resources found, only two gave any type of task management timeline. LeGrand (1981) provided a timeline specifically for ordering uniforms, and Bucher's (1975) timeline specifically discussed ordering equipment. Jones (1988) addressed the amount of time an athletic director spent on athletic department tasks each day, and Basting (1990) added to his survey instrument a time management component. None of the above studies offered starting dates and ending dates for athletic department tasks. The small number of resources was not conducive to obtaining either a wide variety of viewpoints or a depth of insight from the viewpoints.

Although the overall return rate of the surveys fell within accepted guidelines, the return rate was still lower than expected. Four factors could have impacted the poor return rate of the original survey in an adverse manner: the complexity of the original

survey; the form of the original survey, which was a hard copy rather than e-mail or web based; the time of year the survey was sent out - September; the fact that principals have been inundated with surveys on a weekly basis; and the fact that some principals did not see the importance of the survey. The complexity of the original survey and the survey format were changed, and the importance of the survey was stressed via phone conversations. These adjustments seemed to produce an increase in the survey's return rate.

An adverse impact of the low return rate was the lack of variety of the responses. Statistical differences might have emerged if there were a greater number of responses. The low return rate prevented a depth of responses in the comments from both the principals and the athletic directors.

Qualitative follow-up questions were created and were sent to the participants, and an interview with a principal based on the responses to the follow-up questions was planned. The abysmal return rate for the follow-up questions, 6% from principals and 0% from athletic directors, necessitated the abandonment of coding the responses of the follow-up questions and cancelling the interview. The follow-up questions addressed a principal's experience as a coach. It might have been beneficial to include the principal's interest in athletics. Many principals, 32%, had no coaching experience.

The middle school athletic directors provided excellent feedback concerning the layout of the pilot survey. Changes were made to clarify how the start dates and due dates should be noted. It might have been more advantageous to pilot the survey with the high school athletic directors in Richmond County because there is a variance between the tasks at the middle school level and the high school level.

Summary

Principals' roles and responsibilities have changed over the years. Principals have been expected to both lead the people and manage the programs at their schools. Their role as managers has involved the supervision of programs and the evaluation of personnel. Evaluation of personnel entails developing professional improvement plans whenever necessary. In order to evaluate athletic directors, to create personal improvement plans, and to institute personal improvement plans for athletic directors, principals need an awareness of both athletic department tasks and the time required to complete those tasks.

The purpose of this study was to discover the relationship between principals' experiences and athletic directors' experiences in the areas of the priority of selected athletic department tasks, to determine the time required to accomplish those athletic department tasks, and to develop a guide to athletic department task management based on the responses given by the athletic directors who participated in the study.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RESEARCH LITERATURE

Principals' responsibilities and roles have varied from state to state (Weiner, 1979), and they have changed over the years (Geocaris, 2004). This chapter investigates national, state, and local standards of principals' responsibilities and roles. The researcher also explores those studies that address athletic directors' responsibilities and roles. State and county job descriptions for athletic directors are examined. Those studies, which consider principals' responsibilities as they relate to an athletic department, are reviewed at the end of this chapter.

Principals' Responsibilities and Roles

The responsibilities and roles of high school principals have been many and varied (Bouillette, 1996), and these responsibilities and roles have been in a state of flux (Kelly, 2003). Principals' roles have changed over the years from managers to instructional leaders (Geocaris, 2004). Principals' management responsibilities have been: "total operation of the school" (Weiner, 1979, p. vii), "selecting and supervising the staff" (Kelly, p. 43), and "time management" (Geocaris, p. vii). High school principals display leadership in the fields of: "curriculum and instruction, personnel duties, school community relations, management, and leadership" (Henderson, 2002, p. vii). Whether they are leaders or they are managers, principals must still supervise the various departments in their school (Kelly).

The common responsibilities and roles among the studies investigated have been divided into the following groups: personnel, pupils, budget, building, and program. The number of responsibilities and roles range from as few as four in Bouillette's study

(1996) to as many as the 34 listed by Henderson (2002). The responsibilities range from the intricacies of the budget making process (Geocaris, 2004; Weiner, 1979) to the seemingly simple responsibility of "... to make decisions ..." (Kelly, 2003, p. 52). Each of the studies used placed the responsibility of the school's overall functioning at the feet of the principal.

Boyd (2002), Colson (2007), Hughes (2006), Plutko (2002), and Yarborough (2002) each focused on the unique challenges facing 21st century principals. Boyd investigated the impact of school choice, as available through magnet schools and charter schools, on the public schools of Georgia. Boyd concluded, "As choice opportunities expand in Georgia, it will be vital for public school administrators to understand how to market their schools" (p. 98). Colson addressed the emerging responsibility of principals in the area of providing mentoring for new teachers. "The research also found that administrators at all levels have a vital role in the mentoring of beginning teachers to ensure that the high-quality beginning teachers being hired are supported, happy, and decide to stay in the teaching profession" (p.91). Hughes studied the responsibility and role of the principal in the area of creating an ethical school. She stated, "Although principals feel a strong personal commitment to ethics, many principals do not have formal ethical training programs in place for their school community, especially in terms of developing an ethical climate that includes the input from all community stakeholders" (p.139). Plutko focused on the relationship with and the responsibilities of the principal to the athletic department. In his conclusions, Plutko said, "Today's principals often have a lack of knowledge about administering high school athletic programs" (p. 117). Yarborough studied the perceptions of Georgia principals in the area of inclusion. In his

conclusions, he stated, “First, common planning between general and special education teachers is important if these teachers are to be able to collaborate on educational decisions regarding students with and without disabilities. It should be the responsibility of the principal to design the teachers’ schedules in such a way that this common planning can occur” (p. 121). Appendix A contains the responsibilities and roles of principals as listed by the studies used in this research.

National Standards for Principals

The ISLLC *Standards for School Leaders* (1996) pointed out a principal’s responsibilities in six areas. Standard One addressed the principal’s responsibility of developing, articulating, implementing, and maintaining a vision of learning. Standard Two expected the principal to advocate, to nurture, and to sustain a culture that is conducive for student learning and professional growth. Standard Three delineated the principal’s role in managing all aspects of the educational environment. The principal has been given the responsibility to see that the school operates properly. Standard Four pointed out that the principal played a major role in responding to the needs of the community, as well as marshaling community resources to meet those needs. Standard Five explained that the principal has been expected to act “with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner” (Council of Chief State School Officers, 1996, p. 18). Standard Six challenged the principal to help students become successful by influencing the larger community.

The ELCC *Standards for Advanced Programs in Educational Leadership* (2002) articulated the expected knowledge, experience, and performance of principals and superintendents in seven areas. These areas closely resembled the six areas of the ISLLC

standards. Standard Three of the ELCC standards addressed organization and management of the total school environment.

Selected State Standards for Principals

The states of Illinois, Iowa, Idaho, Ohio, Georgia, and South Carolina were selected for this study as a matter of convenience. Illinois and Iowa had the highest statewide SAT[®] scores; Idaho and Ohio had statewide SAT[®] scores that fell in the middle of the range; and Georgia and South Carolina had the lowest statewide SAT[®] scores. There has been a great deal of discussion concerning the causes for the wide range of statewide SAT[®] scores (Marriner, 2007). The SAT[®] scores were used in this study simply as a means of selecting evaluation instruments and job descriptions from several states.

An e-mail message was sent to the state department of education of the aforementioned states. The message requested either a copy of the state standards for principals or the URL where the standard could be found. The only state department to reply to this request was Ohio. Ohio's Standard #3, much like the third ISLLC standard and the third ELCC standard, focused on management of the organizations within the school program (Ohio State Board of Education, 2005).

Selected Counties' Principal Job Descriptions

Job descriptions for principals were requested from each of the two largest counties of the states listed above. The selection of the two largest counties was simply a matter of convenience. Job descriptions were received via e-mail from the Des Moines Public School system in Iowa; the Boise Independent School district in Idaho; the Greenville County School system in South Carolina; and the Richmond County Board of Education in Georgia. All of the principals' job descriptions included supervision of the

entire school program and the observation and evaluation of all school personnel. The job descriptions reflected the items identified in the various research studies listed in the reference section of this document.

Selected States' Teacher Evaluation Instruments

Teacher evaluation instruments were obtained via e-mail from Iowa, Georgia, and South Carolina. Each state's instrument contained a time management component. In Iowa's *Comprehensive Evaluation* instrument, the sixth standard spoke to time management. Georgia's *Georgia Teacher Observation Instrument (GTOI)* concentrated on time management in the second management standard. South Carolina's teacher evaluation instrument, *Assisting, Developing, and Evaluating Professional Teaching (ADEPT)*, offered 10 ADEPT Performance Standards (APS). APS #9 focused on time management in the classroom.

Why Study Athletic Department Tasks?

In personal conversations with Richmond County's Athletic Director and with various Richmond County high school principals (January 23 – 25, 2007), it was discovered that the athletic department had the largest budget of any of the departments at a typical high school and that the athletic staff was larger than any other department's staff. Howard and Gillis (2006) revealed that nationally there was a 50% participation rate in extra-curricular activities among high school students during the 2005 – 2006 school year. As much as educators would like to think that school and community pride are related to outstanding academics, school and community pride have been often more closely related to the school's athletic success (Cox, 2002 and Plutko, 2002).

Athletic Directors' Responsibilities and Roles

Taylor (1984), Thompson (1987), Basting (1990), and Epps (1991) delineated the responsibilities and roles of athletic directors. The responsibilities and roles presented in the various studies can be categorized as personnel, pupils, budget, building, and program. The athletic director has been responsible for “the total athletic program,” (Taylor, p. 107); for “scheduling and managerial operations” (Basting, p. 104); for “business management” (Epps, p. 57); and for developing “athletic programs which contribute to the emotional, social, physical, and mental growth of youth” (Thompson, p. 10). Appendix B contains the responsibilities and roles of athletic directors as listed by the studies used in this research.

Selected County Athletic Director Job Descriptions

The Richmond County Board of Education’s athletic department manual covered job descriptions of coaches, business managers, and athletic directors. The RCBE *Athletic Manual* set forth 18 items in the job description of the athletic director. These 18 areas loosely reflected the tasks identified in the various aforementioned empirical studies.

Copies of the DesMoines Public Schools’ Activity Director’s job description and Linn-Mar Community School District’s athletic director’s job description were obtained via e-mail. DesMoines Public Schools employed an activity director at each high school. Linn-Mar Community School District employed an assistant principal at each high school who served as the school’s athletic director. These job descriptions also contained the items mentioned in the various research studies. All of the athletic directors’ job descriptions used various terms and phrases to address the completion of tasks in a timely manner.

Making the Connection Between Principals and Athletic Directors

Because the principal must evaluate the athletic director, and because part of that evaluation involves time management, principals should know what an athletic director's duties are, and principals should know how long it takes to complete those duties (Jones, 1988 and Plutko, 2002). Principals have had job descriptions for athletic directors at their disposal, yet if the athletic director was not performing tasks in a timely manner, how could the principal develop an improvement plan without a rubric outlining the tasks and the time required for each task? One would think that it would have been a simple task to have found studies, manuals, and texts which clearly presented the various tasks required of an athletic director and the amount of time required to complete those tasks. An online search for "athletic department handbook" or "sports administration" produced three general categories of documents: individual school department manuals, textbooks, and how-to-books. The information in individual school's department manuals (Denney, 1986 & 1987; The Hewlett School, 1996; Gritton, 2001; Sacred Heart Academy, 2002; and Cheverus High School, 2003) ranged from practice start dates to requirements for earning an award letter. Some topics that athletic administration textbooks covered were personnel management, how to make a budget, and caring for facilities (Gabrielsen & Miles, 1958; Healey, 1961; George & Lehmann, 1966; Broyles, 1979; Parkhouse, 1996; Masteralexis, Barr, and Hums, 1998; and Parks & Quarterman, 2003). Athletic department how-to-books (Forsythe, 1956; Griffin, 1967; Forsythe & Keller 1972; Emery, 1978; and Gunsten, 1978) discussed hosting tournaments, forms for inventory control, accident report forms, transportation request forms, and coaches' job descriptions. Of the resources found, only two gave any type of task management

timeline. LeGrand (1981) provided a timeline specifically for ordering uniforms, and Bucher's (1975) timeline specifically discussed ordering equipment.

While there were several studies which focused on athletic director job descriptions, Jones (1988) conducted the only study, to this researcher's knowledge, that addressed the amount of time athletic directors spent on their varied tasks. Although the focus of Basting's (1990) study was on athletic director role expectations, the instrument used in the study also asked the respondents to estimate the percentage of time they spent on various athletic department tasks. Basting suggested, "Athletic directors need to reassess the time spent on various functions which are part of the responsibilities of the position" (p. 107). Jones' study investigated the amount of time an athletic director spent per week on the various athletic department tasks. Athletic directors' responses indicated that they spent 81 hours a week performing both physical education department head duties and athletic director duties. Although the results of this study were somewhat surprising, the study did not uncover the amount of time required to complete each task. For example, the athletic directors mentioned that they spent 2 hours a week completing eligibility paperwork (Jones). Yet, the research does not reveal how far in advance of the eligibility report due date they started the eligibility paperwork process. Nor does the research show if the athletic director spent 2 hours per week on eligibility paperwork every week for the entire school year. Jones recommended a study of the actual amount of time required to complete selected athletic department tasks.

Epps' (1991) research pointed out that, according to the NFHS, a school's principal is the official contact person in matters dealing with rule adherence. Plutko (2002) mentioned in his conclusions that many principals lack the knowledge to make

informed athletic department decisions. In addition to the responsibility of supervising the athletic director and the athletic program, Anderson (1999) explained that many principals of Class B high schools in South Dakota (the smallest high schools in the state) also served as the school's athletic director. His study also revealed that at the Class A (the mid-size high schools in South Dakota) and Class B levels 55% of the athletic directors also served as district or school administrators: district superintendent 11.4%, principal 21.7%, and assistant principal 21.9%. In 85 out of the 402 (21%) GHSA member schools, either the school's principal or one of the school's assistant principals also served as the athletic director. Interestingly enough, in the GHSA, 27 of the 87 (31%) athletic directors who also have school administrative duties served in Class AAAAA (the largest classification in Georgia) schools (Georgia High School Association, 2007).

Summary

At the national level there were two instruments that set forth a principal's job responsibilities. The ISLLC *Standards for School Leaders* (1996) were designed as a measuring tool for principals. The ELCC *Standards for Advanced Programs in Educational Leadership* (2002) measured educational leader training programs. The Ohio Department of Education posted standards for principals on their web page. Some states provided evaluation tools to their educational leaders. Georgia's and South Carolina's teacher evaluation instruments were examples of these evaluation tools. Lastly, many local systems had job descriptions on hand for both the principal and the athletic director. Job descriptions from Richmond County, GA; Boise County, ID; and DesMoines County, IA, listed oversight of the entire school program as one of a principal's many

responsibilities. The national standards, state standards, and local job descriptions all addressed the principal's responsibility of observation and evaluation.

Athletics represented a large portion of a school's program. Athletics have been important to the students, to the school, and to the community. The investigation of the literature in the field of athletics and of local athletic director job descriptions developed an understanding of the athletic director's duties and developed a grasp of how a principal can assist the athletic director to properly carry out those duties. All of the studies referenced, all of the standards investigated, and all of the job descriptions listed included the athletic director's ability to meet the job requirements in a timely manner.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study was to discover the relationship between principals' experiences and athletic directors' experiences in the areas of the priority of selected athletic department tasks, to determine the time required to accomplish those athletic department tasks, and to develop a guide to athletic department task management based on the responses given by the athletic directors who participated in the study.

Research Question

The overarching research question was: To what extent do principals' responses and athletic directors' responses differ concerning athletic department tasks?

The sub-questions were:

1. How do principals' responses and athletic directors' responses vary in prioritizing selected athletic department tasks?
2. How does the principals' rank order of selected athletic department tasks and the athletic directors' rank order of selected athletic department tasks differ?
3. How do principals' responses and athletic directors' responses vary in the assessment of the start date and the end date of selected athletic department tasks?
4. How does the principals' number of days allotted for completing selected athletic department tasks differ from the athletic directors' number of days allotted for completing selected athletic department tasks?

Population

The population for this study was the principals and athletic directors of the 402 schools that are members in the Georgia High School Association (GHSA).

Sample Population

A purposive random sample of 100 principals and the athletic directors who work with those principals was selected from the GHSA member schools. Purposive sampling is generally a qualitative technique whereby individuals are selected on purpose (Glesne, 1999). Trochim (2006) stated, “In purposive sampling, we sample with a *purpose* in mind. We usually would have one or more specific predefined groups we are seeking” (p. 35. Italics in original quote.). There were five divisions in the GHSA. The schools have been classified by the GHSA according to size. Class A consists of the smallest schools in the state, and Class AAAAA is made up of the largest schools in the state. This classification created a natural stratification. “Stratification means that specific characteristics of individuals (e.g. both females and males) are represented in the sample and the sample reflects the true proportion of individuals with certain characteristics of the population” (Creswell, 2003, p. 156). As a matter of convenience, the schools were listed in each division in alphabetical order, and 20 schools were randomly selected from each division. The 20 random numbers for each section were generated using Urbaniak’s and Plous’ (2007) on-line random generator. Thus a purposive random sample was obtained. Robb (2002) suggested that a purposive random sample allowed for selecting participants with common characteristics and included a measure of randomness. This type of sampling has also been called stratified or quota sampling (Springhill, 2003).

Instrument

The researcher-created *Athletic Department Task Management Survey* (Appendix C) contained ten questions concerning selected athletic department tasks. The *Athletic Department Task Management Survey* was a quantitative survey. “Quantitative research, as we have seen, is based on numerical data, whereas qualitative research is purely descriptive and therefore not really measurement based” (Springhill, 2003, p. 216).

The major advantages of surveys are that they facilitate large amounts of data to be gathered with relatively little effort, supporting broad generalizations of results. Also, a high level of control regarding sample subjects makes reduction of bias possible thus increasing validity.

However, surveys suffer from providing only a snapshot of studied phenomena and rely highly on the subjective views of the respondents (Kjeldshov and Graham, 2003, p. 321).

The survey questions sought to elicit a response for sports that were representative of each sport season: fall – football and cross-country, winter – basketball and wrestling, and spring – baseball and golf. The survey addressed the priority of each task. One would assume that if a task were listed on a job description, it would be important. Yet, all tasks might not carry the same priority in the eyes of the principals and the athletic directors. The participants were asked to prioritize the tasks on a scale of 5 to 1. A Category 5 task was critical, and failure to complete the task by the due date resulted in fines, sanctions, or forfeitures. Category 4 tasks were more important than Category 3 tasks, but not as important as Category 5 tasks. Tasks which fell into Category 3 were those tasks, which must be completed by the due date. Failure to complete these tasks on time resulted in

reprimands or poor community relations. Category 2 tasks were more important than Category 1 tasks, but not as important as Category 3 tasks. Category 1 tasks should be completed by their due date. If Category 1 tasks were not completed by their due date, the greatest consequence would be frustration and strained relations with players, parents, coaches, school administration, and other school staff members.

The survey questions also asked the start date for each task and the due date for each task. The survey was limited to those tasks which were common to the surveys used in the studies referenced and to those tasks which lend themselves to an identifiable start date and due date.

Reliability

Middle school athletic directors in Richmond County, Georgia, were asked to complete the survey to test the reliability of the researcher-designed survey. Revisions to the survey were made as needed.

Data Collection

The *Athletic Department Task Management Survey* and a principals' cover letter (Appendix D) were sent to the principals via United States Postal Service first class mail. Kerlinger and Lee (2000) hold a very dim view of mail surveys. They offered two drawbacks to mail surveys: "lack of responses and the inability to verify the responses given" (p. 603). Creswell (2003) on the other hand, did not offer disparaging remarks towards mail surveys, but did give suggestions that, if followed, would increase the return rate of mail surveys. Unfortunately, his suggestions were discovered after the survey process had ended. A self-addressed, stamped, return envelope was included in the survey packet. The week after the surveys were mailed out, an e-mail message was sent

to all the principals reminding them to mail the survey back at the end of the week. Those principals whose e-mail addresses were not readily obtainable from their school's web site were sent a reminder post card. The e-mail/post card message also offered to the principals another survey and return envelope if they had misplaced the original survey.

A stamped post card was included in each packet. The message on the post card offered to send to the principals the results of the study if they returned the post card. The principals were asked to mail the post card separately from the survey in order to maintain anonymity.

At the end of the two-week survey window, surveys from 15 principal and athletic director pairs had been received. Another e-mail message was sent out. This message contained a copy of the survey, and the request that the principal and the athletic director complete the survey digitally, and return it as soon as possible. The e-mail message netted surveys from an additional seven schools. The return rate of 22% was unacceptable. Rudestan and Newton (2000) suggested a return rate between 25% and 40%. Ten percent of the participants who completed and returned the original survey stated that the survey was rather long and/or somewhat confusing. Therefore, the survey was shortened to cover just football, basketball, and baseball. Phone calls were made to all the principals in the sample group requesting their assistance. The dilemma of a low return rate was explained and the fact that the survey had been revamped was mentioned. Forty-five principals agreed to complete the survey and to send the survey on to their athletic director. The revised principals' survey (Appendix E) and the revised athletic directors' survey (Appendix F) were sent via e-mail. Of those 45 commitments, 28

principals and 15 athletic directors completed the surveys, and returned them via e-mail. The final return rate was 50% for principals and 37% for athletic directors.

Data Analysis

The responses of the principals and the responses of the athletic directors to the question regarding the priority of the selected athletic department tasks were analyzed via a *t*-test to determine if there was any significant difference ($p < .05$) between the answers of the two groups. The principals' answers and the athletic directors' answers concerning the start date and the due date for the selected athletic department tasks were analyzed via a *t*-test to determine if there was any significant difference ($p < .05$) between the answers of the two groups. A *t*-test measures the difference in the squares of the sample means (Sprinthall, 2003).

$$t = \frac{(M_1 - M_2) - \mu_{M_1 - M_2}}{SE_D}$$

The *t*-test calculations were conducted on Motulsky's (2004) *GraphPad* an on-line statistical calculator. The tasks were placed in rank order based on the mean of each group's priority. The *Guide to Athletic Department Task Management* (Appendix G) was developed from the athletic directors' responses.

There was no significant difference between the responses of the principals and the responses of the athletic directors with regards to the amount of time required to start and to complete the various tasks surveyed. There was significant difference between their responses concerning the priority of scheduling referees and in creating an eligibility list. There was a significant difference between the number of principals with coaching experience who provided starting and ending dates and those principals without coaching experience who provided starting and ending dates. A qualitative survey was created

(Appendix H) to attempt to discover if a principal's experience or lack of experience as a coach impacted their responses. Principals' follow-up questions addressed their coaching experience, and offered the principal the opportunity to add athletic tasks that were not included on the original survey. Athletic directors' follow-up questions (Appendix I) focused only on any additional tasks. The follow-up questions were sent via e-mail. A copy of the *Guide to Athletic Department Task Management* was attached to the e-mail message. The follow up questions and the proposed interview of a principal based on the responses of the follow up questions would have moved this study from a quantitative study with a small qualitative component to a mixed method study with both a quantitative and a qualitative component. Glesne (1999) and Creswell (2003) both explain that quantitative surveys attempt to determine the "what" of an observed phenomena, and qualitative surveys or research methods are those that attempt to determine the "why" behind observed phenomena. The following analogy might help to distinguish between quantitative and qualitative research methods. Athletic contests are usually broadcast with a team of announcers. One is the play-by-play announcer, and the other is the color commentator. The play-by-play announcer gives the specifics of the situation: down and distance, time left on the clock, or the ball-strike count on the batter. The play-by-play announcer also provides the "what" of the action: the play resulted in a 14-yard touchdown, the last shot was missed, or the batter hit a home run. The color commentator fills in the "why" of the action: the tailback scored because the fullback successfully blocked the linebacker, the last shot was missed because the shooter was off balance, or the batter hit a homerun because the curve ball did not break. Mixed method studies, those studies which use both quantitative and qualitative research methods, give

the researcher both the “what” and the “why” of the study (Glesne, 1999 and Creswell, 2003). The return rate for the follow-up questions was 6% for the principals and 0% for the athletic directors. Due to the poor return rate, the responses were not coded and the planned interview was abandoned.

Summary

The purpose of this study was to discover the relationship between principals’ experiences and athletic directors’ experiences in the areas of the priority of selected athletic department tasks, to determine the time required to accomplish those athletic department tasks, and to develop a guide to athletic department task management based on the responses given by the athletic directors who participated in the study.

The population for this study was the principals and athletic directors of the 402 schools in the GHSA. A purposive random sample of 100 principals and the athletic directors who work with those principals was selected from the GHSA member schools. There were five divisions in the GHSA (A – AAAAA); therefore, 20 principal and athletic director pairs were randomly selected from each division.

The principals’ answers and the athletic directors’ answers to sub-questions one and three were analyzed via a *t*-test to determine if there was any significant difference ($p < .05$) between the answers of the two groups. There was no significant difference in the responses relating to starting and ending dates, but there was a significant difference between the responses concerning the priority of scheduling referees and in creating an eligibility list.

CHAPTER IV

REPORT OF DATA AND DATA ANALYSIS

The purpose of this study was to discover the relationship between principals' experiences and athletic directors' experiences in the areas of the priority of selected athletic department tasks, to determine the time required to accomplish those athletic department tasks, and to develop a guide to athletic department task management based on the responses given by the athletic directors who participated in the study.

The overarching research question was: To what extent do principals' responses and athletic directors' responses differ concerning athletic department tasks?

The sub-questions were:

1. How do principals' responses and athletic directors' responses vary in prioritizing selected athletic department tasks?
2. How does the principals' rank order of selected athletic department tasks and the athletic directors' rank order of selected athletic department tasks differ?
3. How do principals' responses and athletic directors' responses vary in the assessment of the start date and the end date of selected athletic department tasks?
4. How does the principals' number of days allotted for completing selected athletic department tasks differ from the athletic directors' number of days allotted for completing selected athletic department tasks?

Demographic Data of Principals

The demographic data of the high school principals was quite interesting. In 2007, the Georgia Professional Standards Commission (PSC) collected principal data in the

following categories: experience, age, gender, ethnicity, and degrees earned. The principals in this sample group were compared in the areas of experience, age, and gender with the principals in Georgia.

Table 1

Principals' Age and Gender

Principals <i>N</i> = 50	Results	Percentage of Participants Where Applicable
Age – mean	48 years	
Age – range	33 – 69 years	
Gender	11 – women	22 %
	39 – men	78%

According to the PSC (2007), 42% of the high school principals in Georgia were women. Twenty-two percent of the survey participants were women. The percent of women participants and of women principals did not compare favorably. The Age mean of principals in Georgia was 48 years. The Age mean of the survey participants was 48 years. The Age range of the participants in the survey compared favorably to the Age range of principals in the State of Georgia (Table 1).

Table 2

Principals' Career Experience

Principals	Results <i>N</i> = 50	Percentage of Participants Where Applicable
Position	49 – Principal	98%
	1 – Principal and Athletic Director	2%
With Coaching Experience	33	66%
Years of Coaching Experience – mean	8	
Years of Administrative Experience – mean	11	
Years at Current School – mean	6	
Years in Education – mean	24	

The Years in Education mean for all high school principals in the State of Georgia was 23 years. The Years in Education mean of the survey participants was 24 years.

There were 10 principals in the State of Georgia who also served as their school's athletic director. One of those principals was a participant in this study. The PSC did not track the

number of years an individual had served as a coach, as an administrator, or their tenure at a particular school (Table 2).

Table 3

Principals' Returned Surveys

School Size	Returned Survey	Did Not Return Survey	Expected Surveys to be Returned
A	12	8	20
AA	12	8	20
AAA	13	7	20
AAAA	4	16	20
AAAAA	9	11	20
Totals	50	50	100

Chi square value equals 5.400

There was no significant difference (chi square (4) = 5.400, $p > .5$, ns) among the number of returned surveys of the principals from the various classifications, even though a higher number of principals from the three lowest classifications returned their survey (Table 3). A chi square test is used to determine if there is a statistical difference in the frequency of occurrence in each category.

$$x^2 = \sum \frac{(f_o - f_e)^2}{f_e}$$

A chi square test is used when the data is nominal: yes or no, A or B, off or on (Sprinthall, 2003). The critical value for the chi square test was obtained via Motulsky's (2004) *GraphPad* an on-line statistical calculator.

Demographic Data of Athletic Directors

The State of Georgia's PSC did not maintain demographic data for the position of school athletic director; therefore, there were no statewide demographics to use for comparison.

Table 4

Athletic Directors' Age and Gender

Athletic Directors	Results	Percentage of Participants
	<i>N</i> = 37	Where Applicable
Age – mean	46 years	
Age – range	35-64 years	
Gender	1 – women	3%
	36 – men	97%

The Age mean of the athletic directors was two years less than the Age mean of the principals. The Age range of the athletic directors compared favorably with the Age range of principals in the State of Georgia. There was a lower percentage of women athletic directors who participated in the survey than there was of women principals who participated in the study (Table 4).

Table 5

Athletic Directors' Career Experience

Athletic Directors	Results <i>N</i> = 37	Percentage of Participants Where Applicable
Position	9 – Principal and athletic Director	24%
	28 –Athletic Director	76%
Years of Coaching Experience - mean	21	
Years at Current School – mean	11	
Years in Education - mean	22	

The Years in Education mean of the athletic directors was two years less than the Years in Education mean of the principals. Athletic directors had been at their school for 11 years as compared to the principals' six years. Twenty-two assistant principals in the State of Georgia also served as their schools' athletic director. Forty-one percent of those individuals participated in this study (Table 5).

Table 6

Athletic Directors' Returned Surveys

School size	Returned Survey	Did Not Return Survey	Expected Surveys to be Returned
A	10	10	20
AA	6	14	20
AAA	9	11	20
AAAA	4	16	20
AAAAA	8	12	20
Totals	37	63	100

Chi square value equals 3.135

There was no significant difference (chi square (4) = 3.135, $p > .5$, ns) among the returned surveys of the athletic directors from the various classifications, even though a higher number of athletic directors from the lowest classification returned their survey (Table 6).

Relationship Between Groups' Responses

Table 7

The Number of Principals Who Provided Dates Compared With the Number of Athletic Directors Who Provided Dates

Participants	Provided Dates	Did Not Provide Dates	Total
Principals	29	21	50
Athletic Directors	32	5	37
Total	61	26	87

Chi square value equals 8.235

There was a significant difference (chi square (1) = 8.235, $p < .1$) between the number of principals who provided responses to the survey questions concerning the start date and the due date for selected athletic department tasks and the number of athletic directors who provided responses to the survey questions concerning the start date and the due date for selected athletic department tasks (Table 7). A firm conclusion cannot be drawn as to the impacting factors which caused 42% of the principals to not provide dates for the tasks. Researcher bias based on the comments of those principals is that they did not know the start dates and the due dates.

Table 8

The Number of Principals With Coaching Experience Who Provided Responses Compared With the Number of Principals Without Coaching Experience Who Provided Responses

Principals	Provided Dates	Did Not Provide Dates	Total
With Coaching Experience	25	8	33
Without Coaching Experience	4	13	17
Total	29	21	50

Chi square value equals 14.880

There was a significant difference (chi square (1) = 14.880, $p < .5$) between the number of principals with coaching experience who provided responses to the survey questions concerning the start date and the due date for selected athletic department tasks and the number of principals without coaching experience who provided responses to the survey questions concerning the start date and the due date for selected athletic department tasks (Table 8). It would appear that principals without coaching experience did not know the start date and the due date of the various tasks. This is only an assumption. Answers to the follow up questions could well have provided insight into this assumption.

Survey Questions and Results

Initially, it was expected that the survey would not reveal a significant difference between the responses of the principals and the athletic directors concerning priority of athletic department tasks, but that there would be a significant difference between the responses addressing the start date and the due date of the various tasks. The only significant difference found between the respondents was over priority, and those differences were found on only two survey items.

Table 9

Survey Question One: Priority For Creating A Budget

Group	<i>N</i>	Mean	SD	SE _M
Principals	36	4.22	1.05	.17
Athletic Directors	32	4.41	1.01	.18

There was no significant difference ($t(66) = .7385, p > .5, ns$) between the responses of the principals and the responses of the athletic directors concerning the priority of creating a budget (Table 9). Several principals stated that they work very closely with their athletic director to create a budget. This could account for the low t value.

Table 10

Survey Question Two: Priority For Ordering Equipment

Group	<i>N</i>	Mean	SD	SE _M
Principals	32	3.59	1.52	.27
Athletic Directors	31	4.10	.91	.16

There was no significant difference ($t(61) = 1.5876, p > .5, ns$) between the responses of the principals and the responses of the athletic directors concerning the priority of ordering equipment (Table 10). Many principals stressed the importance of having the required equipment and the importance of having the equipment in time for the start of practice. Athletic directors did rank this priority higher than the principals.

Table 11

Survey Question Three: Priority For Scheduling Athletic Contests

Group	<i>N</i>	Mean	SD	SE _M
Principals	34	3.85	1.54	.26
Athletic Directors	31	4.43	.76	.14

There was no significant difference ($t(63) = 1.8495, p > .5, ns$) between the responses of the principals and the responses of the athletic directors concerning the priority of scheduling athletic contests (Table 11). The critical value for t with 60 degrees of freedom is 2.000, and the critical value for t with 70 degrees of freedom is 1.9994.

Even though there was no significant difference between the responses between the principals and the athletic directors, the value of t is very close to being significant. It seems odd given the principals' experience in athletics that they would rank the priority of this task lower than the athletic directors.

Table 12

Survey Question Four: Priority For Obtaining Game Contracts

Group	N	Mean	SD	SE _M
Principals	34	3.52	1.35	.23
Athletic Directors	30	3.87	.78	.14

There was no significant difference ($t(61) = 1.2508, p > .5, ns$) between the responses of the principals and the responses of the athletic directors concerning the priority of obtaining game contracts (Table 12). A few athletic directors stated that football and basketball are the only sports which the GHSA require game contracts. This could account for the low priority.

Table 13

Survey Question Five: Priority For Scheduling Referees

Group	N	Mean	SD	SE _M
Principals	36	3.44	1.46	.24
Athletic Directors	32	4.09	1.00	.18

There was a significant difference ($t(66) = 2.1127, p < .5$) between the responses of the principals and the responses of the athletic directors concerning the priority of scheduling referees (Table 13). It is quite surprising that the principals gave this task such a low priority. Although officials rarely, if ever, impact which team wins and which team loses the game, good officials are those who manage the game without being noticed.

Table 14

Survey Question Six: Priority For Scheduling Contest Transportation

Group	<i>N</i>	Mean	SD	SE _M
Principals	34	3.71	1.34	.23
Athletic Directors	34	4.21	.84	.14

There was no significant difference ($t(66) = 1.8426, p > .5, ns$) between the responses of the principals and the responses of the athletic directors concerning the priority of scheduling contest transportation (Table 14). Ten principals stated that the coaches had Commercial Drivers Licenses, and the school had an activity bus; therefore, scheduling transportation was not a high priority task to them. It might be that athletic directors rank transportation higher than the principals because they know that if the players don't make it to the game, then there is no game. Three athletic directors stated that they drove the school's activity bus to the games.

Table 15

Survey Question Seven: Priority For Eligibility Lists

Group	<i>N</i>	Mean	SD	SE _M
Principals	34	4.18	1.29	.22
Athletic Directors	31	4.90	.40	.07

There was a significant difference ($t(63) = 3.0076, p < .5$) between the responses of the principals and the responses of the athletic directors concerning the priority of eligibility lists (Table 15). It is quite odd that there is a significant difference for the priority of this task. The GHSA places a high value on schools both submitting an eligibility list and in submitting the list by the due date. The GHSA can and does inflict heavy financial penalties on schools who fail to submit an eligibility list on time or who use an ineligible player.

Table 16

Survey Question Eight: Priority For Evaluating Coaches

Group	<i>N</i>	Mean	SD	SE _M
Principals	33	4.03	1.07	.19
Athletic Directors	28	3.93	1.18	.22

There was no significant difference ($t(59) = .3516, p > .5, ns$) between the responses of the principals and the responses of the athletic directors concerning the

priority of evaluating coaches (Table 16). This is one of the few tasks in which the athletic directors' priority was lower than the principals' priority. The fact that evaluating coaches is more of an administrative task rather than a coaching task might be the reason for the low priority.

Table 17

Survey Question Nine: Priority For Scheduling Practice Facilities

Group	<i>N</i>	Mean	SD	SE _M
Principals	30	3.00	1.39	.25
Athletic Directors	27	3.11	1.22	.23

There was no significant difference ($t(55) = .3193, p > .5, ns$) between the responses of the principals and the responses of the athletic directors concerning the priority of creating a schedule for the use of the practice facilities (Table 17). The responses to this task fell into two major groups. The principals and athletic directors from both large schools and the small schools gave this a low priority because they had no conflicts with the practice facilities. The large schools had enough facilities for each team to practice at the time of the coaches' choosing. The small schools fielded only one team per sport; therefore, there was no need to make a schedule.

Table 18

Survey Question Ten: Priority For Notifying Students and Parents of Physicals

Group	<i>N</i>	Mean	SD	SE _M
Principals	33	3.94	1.41	.25
Athletic Directors	28	4.54	.92	.17

There was no significant difference ($t(59) = 1.9130, p > .5, ns$) between the responses of the principals and the responses of the athletic directors concerning the priority of notifying students and parents of athletic physicals (Table 18). Both principals and athletic directors ranked this task as a higher priority. The GHSA requires each student to have a current physical on file before they can begin practice.

Table 19

Principals' Rank Order of Task Priority and the Athletic Directors' Rank Order Of Task Priority

Principals' Rank Order		Athletic Directors' Rank Order	
Task	Mean Priority	Task	Mean Priority
Creating a Budget	4.22	Eligibility Lists	4.90
Eligibility Lists	4.18	Scheduling Physicals	4.54
Observation and Evaluation	4.03	Scheduling Contests	4.43
Scheduling Physicals	3.94	Creating a Budget	4.41
Scheduling Contests	3.85	Scheduling Transportation	4.21
Scheduling Transportation	3.71	Ordering Equipment	4.10
Ordering Equipment	3.59	Scheduling Referees	4.09
Game Contracts	3.52	Observation and Evaluation	3.93
Scheduling Referees	3.44	Game Contracts	3.87
Scheduling Practice Facilities	3.00	Scheduling Practice Facilities	3.11

Although there was a significant difference between only two tasks regarding task priority, the rank order of the tasks for each group was not the same (Table 19). The

principals' order of tasks ranks the administrative tasks of the athletic director that impact the school's standing with the Central Office higher than other tasks. The athletic directors' rank those tasks which relate to the school's relationship with the athletic association higher than other tasks.

Table 20

Survey Question One: Days Indicated For The Task Of Creating A Budget

Group	<i>N</i>	Mean	SD	SE _M
Principals	28	61.29	58.55	11.06
Athletic Directors	25	58.36	36.68	7.34

There was no significant difference ($t(51) = .2149, p > .5, ns$) between the responses of the principals and the responses of the athletic directors concerning the number of days spent creating the budget (Table 20). Based on this researcher's experience as an athletic director and on conversations with athletic directors, the principal would instruct the athletic director to create a budget and to turn it in on a specific day; therefore, the principals should be well aware of the number of days allocated for this task.

Table 21

Survey Question Two: Days Indicated For Ordering Equipment

Group	<i>N</i>	Mean	SD	SE _M
Principals	52 _a	96.25	68.49	9.50
Athletic Directors	84 _b	93.04	59.70	6.51

^a Participants were queried in three sports. The *N* represents the responses for all three sports.

^b Participants were queried in three sports. The *N* represents the responses for all three sports.

There was no significant difference ($t(134) = .2883, p > .5, ns$) between the responses of the principals and the responses of the athletic directors concerning the number of days spent ordering equipment (Table 21). Athletic directors stated that they work on their equipment order year-a-round, but turn it in 90+ days before they need the equipment. Twenty-six percent of the principals mentioned that equipment was ordered in the spring for fall sports and in the fall for winter and spring sports.

Table 22

Survey Question Three: Days Indicated For Scheduling Athletic Contests

Group	<i>N</i>	Mean	SD	SE _M
Principals	51 _a	113.90	90.03	12.61
Athletic Directors	76 _b	93.33	82.53	9.47

^a Participants were queried in three sports. The *N* represents the responses for all three sports.

^b Participants were queried in three sports. The *N* represents the responses for all three sports.

There was no significant difference ($t(125) = 1.3276, p > .5, ns$) between the responses of the principals and the responses of the athletic directors concerning the number of days spent scheduling athletic contests (Table 22). One principal mentioned that she worked very closely with the athletic director in the scheduling process. She wanted to make sure that the teams did not play more games than were allowed, and she wanted to make sure that games would not adversely impact the various tests given throughout the year.

Table 23

Survey Question Four: Days Indicated For Obtaining Game Contracts

Group	<i>N</i>	Mean	SD	SE _M
Principals	38 ^a	101.29	83.89	13.61
Athletic Directors	60 ^b	77.13	70.27	9.07

^a Participants were queried in three sports. The *N* represents the responses for all three sports.

^b Participants were queried in three sports. The *N* represents the responses for all three sports.

There was no significant difference ($t(96) = 1.5369, p > .5, ns$) between the responses of the principals and the responses of the athletic directors concerning the number of days spent obtaining game contracts (Table 23). Principals are required to sign game contracts; therefore, they felt that they had a good understanding of how long it took to complete this task.

Table 24

Survey Question Five: Days Indicated For Scheduling Referees

Group	<i>N</i>	Mean	SD	SE _M
Principals	41 _a	42.32	41.24	6.44
Athletic Directors	60 _b	53.90	57.22	7.39

^a Participants were queried in three sports. The *N* represents the responses for all three sports.

^b Participants were queried in three sports. The *N* represents the responses for all three sports.

There was no significant difference ($t(99) = 1.1129, p > .5, ns$) between the responses of the principals and the responses of the athletic directors concerning the number of days spent scheduling referees (Table 24). This task was ranked ninth by principals as far as its priority was concerned, and seventh as far as the number of days required to complete the task. No comments were given by the principals to indicate the reasons behind the task priority or the number of days to complete the task. It might well be that the principals know that the GHSA schedules the officials for both football and basketball. The athletic directors do have the opportunity to request the change of a scheduled official. This might be the reason that athletic directors allocated 11 more days to the task than the principals did.

Table 25

Survey Question Six: Days Indicated For Scheduling Contest Transportation

Group	<i>N</i>	Mean	SD	SE _M
Principals	44 _a	20.30	18.55	2.80
Athletic Directors	85 _b	26.07	36.91	4.00

^a Participants were queried in three sports. The *N* represents the responses for all three sports.

^b Participants were queried in three sports. The *N* represents the responses for all three sports.

There was no significant difference ($t(127) = .9748, p > .5, ns$) between the responses of the principals and the responses of the athletic directors concerning the number of days spent scheduling contest transportation (Table 25). From attendance at coaching clinics, from conversations with other coaches, and from experience, this researcher has learned that coaches want to have as few variables on game day as possible. They want to attempt to eliminate the unknowns. By establishing transportation well in advance of the season, the coach is able to reduce his game day To Do list.

Table 26

Survey Question Seven: Days Indicated For Eligibility Lists

Group	<i>N</i>	Mean	SD	SE _M
Principals	41 _a	48.20	42.05	6.57
Athletic Directors	88 _b	51.89	57.62	6.14

^a Participants were queried in three sports. The *N* represents the responses for all three sports.

^b Participants were queried in three sports. The *N* represents the responses for all three sports.

There was no significant difference ($t(127) = .3669, p > .5, ns$) between the responses of the principals and the responses of the athletic directors concerning the number of days spent creating the eligibility lists (Table 26). Nineteen percent of the athletic directors stated that they work closely with both the principals and the guidance counselors in preparing eligibility lists. Also, the eligibility lists must be signed by the principal before they are sent to the GHSA office. The high level of interaction between the principals and the athletic director might account for the closeness in the number of days allotted for this task.

Table 27

Survey Question Eight: Days Indicated For Evaluating Coaches

Group	<i>N</i>	Mean	SD	SE _M
Principals	48 ^a	145.17	77.14	11.13
Athletic Directors	70 ^b	128.43	68.28	8.16

^a Participants were queried in three sports. The *N* represents the responses for all three sports.

^b Participants were queried in three sports. The *N* represents the responses for all three sports.

There was no significant difference ($t(116) = 1.2405, p > .5, ns$) between the responses of the principals and the responses of the athletic directors concerning the number of days spent evaluating coaches (Table 27). There was little variation between the number of days allotted to this task, because both principals and athletic directors stated they start the evaluation at the beginning of the season and end it at the end of the season.

Table 28

Survey Question Nine: Days Indicated For Scheduling Practice Facilities

Group	<i>N</i>	Mean	SD	SE _M
Principals	25 _a	34.64	45.84	9.17
Athletic Directors	38 _b	42.08	49.57	8.04

^a Participants were queried in three sports. The *N* represents the responses for all three sports.

^b Participants were queried in three sports. The *N* represents the responses for all three sports.

There was no significant difference ($t(61) = .6001, p > .5, ns$) between the responses of the principals and the responses of the athletic directors concerning the number of days spent creating a schedule for the use of the practice facilities (Table 28). The majority of the mid size schools created practice facility schedules. These schedules involve not only the in-season sports; they also involve other school activities. Due to the global nature of this task, the principals and the athletic directors stated that they communicated a great deal with each other.

Table 29

Survey Question Ten: Days Indicated For Notifying Students And Parents Of Physicals

Group	<i>N</i>	Mean	SD	SE _M
Principals	36 _a	56.28	62.65	10.44
Athletic Directors	61 _b	50.07	42.31	5.42

^a Participants were queried in three sports. The *N* represents the responses for all three sports.

^b Participants were queried in three sports. The *N* represents the responses for all three sports.

There was no significant difference ($t(95) = .5823, p > .5, ns$) between the responses of the principals and the responses of the athletic directors concerning the number of days spent notifying students and parents of athletic physicals (Table 29). The athletic directors stated that they coordinate this activity through the main office. This extra level of coordination would appear to be the reason the days allocated for this task were so similar.

Table 30

Rank Order of Number of Days Allotted to Each Task by the Principals as Compared to the Rank Order of the Number of Days Allotted to Each Task by the Athletic Directors

Principals		Athletic Directors	
Task	Days	Task	Days
Observation and Evaluation	145	Observation and Evaluation	128
Scheduling Contests	114	Ordering Equipment	93
Game Contracts	101	Scheduling Contests	93
Ordering Equipment	96	Game Contracts	77
Creating a Budget	61	Creating a Budget	58
Scheduling Physicals	56	Scheduling Referees	54
Eligibility Lists	48	Eligibility Lists	52
Scheduling Referees	42	Scheduling Physicals	50
Scheduling Practice Facilities	35	Scheduling Practice Facilities	42
Scheduling Transportation	20	Scheduling Transportation	26

Although there was no significant difference regarding the number of days allotted to each task, the rank order of the tasks for each group was not the same (Table 30). The tasks of Observation and Evaluation, Creating a Budget, Eligibility Lists, Scheduling Practice Facilities, and Scheduling Transportation hold the same rank for both groups. It appears that the principals and the athletic directors agree on those tasks which have definite time periods set by the Central Office: Observation and Evaluation, Creating a Budget, and Scheduling Transportation. Scheduling Practice Facilities and Creating Eligibility Lists are two tasks in which the principal and athletic director communicate extensively.

Principals' Comments

Space was provided on the survey for principals to make additional comments. The comments made have been categorized into three main groups. The first group of comments revolved around the statement, "That is the Athletic Director's responsibility." The second group of comments was centered around, "I only become involved with this task if it is not completed on time." The third category included statements such as, "I am not aware of the timeline." With the exception of the last group of questions, no decision concerning the knowledge of the principal concerning the start date and the end date of athletic department tasks could be determined.

A few of the principals' comments were as follows. Respondent Number 49, a 39 year-old male with nine years of coaching experience and 10 years of administrative experience, stated,

While I confer with the AD on a number of issues, it is expected that he will oversee and carry out things such as scheduling, game contracts,

referees, ordering equipment, etc. I cannot give you specific timelines on these issues, but I do know that we tend to do things early.

Respondent Number 44, a 37 year-old male with three years of coaching experience and eight years of administrative experience, indicated in the dates section for each task, “AD responsibility.” Respondent Number 10, a 42 year-old male with 16 years of coaching experience, wrote,

As principal, my duties and responsibilities as it pertains to athletics is to oversee that these things are done. They are the athletic director’s responsibilities as outlined in his duties and responsibilities. If these deadlines are not met, that’s when the principal becomes more involved.

I’m more responsible for the overall evaluation of the program itself.

Finally, Respondent Number 15, a 54 year-old female with no coaching experience and 23 years as an administrator, indicated, “As principal of a large school (1,300± students), I delegate tasks such as those identified in the survey. I am fortunate to have an AD and coaches that are trustworthy and responsible. In the event something is not handled, the AD or coach responsible is approached and is responsive.”

Three principals mentioned over the phone that the survey was quite long and confusing. Two refused to participate in the survey, but they did complete the demographic section of the survey. The other was not going to participate, but he relented, and completed both parts of the survey.

This researcher’s bias was that principals were not aware of how long it takes to start and to complete the tasks in the survey. In reality, it might well be that the principals of the high schools in Georgia knew how many days were required to start and to

complete selected athletic department tasks, and that they delegated exceptionally well so as not to interfere with the athletic directors. Also, it might be that the athletic directors in Georgia completed all of their tasks well in advance of the due date and did not need any oversight in this area.

Athletic Directors' Comments

Eight of the 37 athletic directors who participated in the study were also assistant principals. Four of those individuals did not provide the start date and due date for the various tasks. The comments from these four individuals closely aligned with the comments of the principals. Respondent Number 1, a 44 year-old male with 15 years of coaching experience and six years as an assistant principal, indicated that these tasks were the coaches' responsibilities. Respondent Number 2, a 51 year-old male with 30 years of coaching experience and seven years as an assistant principal, stated that the coaches handled these tasks.

Three additional comments re-occurred. First, even though basketball and baseball eligibility lists were not due until after school started, the athletic directors sent in the names of everyone in the school in time to meet the football deadline. Second, all physicals were given at one time. They were usually given in the spring of the year. Third, the smaller schools and the larger schools did not provide start dates and due dates for scheduling practice facilities. The smaller school athletic directors stated that they had only one team per season, and the larger school athletic directors stated that each team had its own practice facility.

Summary

The purpose of this study was to discover the relationship between principals' experiences and athletic directors' experiences in the areas of the priority of selected athletic department tasks, to determine the time required to accomplish those athletic department tasks, and to develop a guide to athletic department task management based on the responses given by the athletic directors who participated in the study.

Analysis of the data indicated that there was a significant difference between the responses for two survey items: survey item five concerning the priority of scheduling officials and survey item seven which asked about eligibility. Both of these tasks were given a higher priority by the athletic directors than by the principals.

An analysis of the demographic data showed that there was a significant difference between the principals with coaching experience and those principals without coaching experience regarding responding to the number of days required for the various tasks. Additionally, many principals without coaching experience indicated in their comments that they either were not aware of the time required, or that they left the tasks completely up to the athletic director.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The responsibilities and roles of the principal have changed greatly over the past few years. One constant has been that principals are ultimately responsible for all programs at the school (Weiner, 1979). Principal responsibilities pertinent to this study were assuring proper time management by teachers and staff (Council of Chief State School Officers, 1996), serving as the official contact person at the school for the NFHS (Epps, 1991) via the GHSA, and the creation of professional development plans when necessary (Kelly, 2003).

Summary

The purpose of this study was to discover the relationship between principals' experiences and athletic directors' experiences in the areas of the priority of selected athletic department tasks, to determine the time required to accomplish those athletic department tasks, and to develop a guide to athletic department task management based on the responses given by the athletic directors who participated in the study.

Research Questions

The overarching research question was: To what extent do principals' responses and athletic directors' responses differ concerning athletic department tasks?

The sub-questions were:

1. How do principals' responses and athletic directors' responses vary in prioritizing selected athletic department tasks?
2. How does the principals' rank order of selected athletic department tasks and the athletic directors' rank order of selected athletic department tasks differ?

3. How do principals' responses and athletic directors' responses vary in the assessment of the start date and the end date of selected athletic department tasks?
4. How does the principals' number of days allotted for completing selected athletic department tasks differ from the athletic directors' number of days allotted for completing selected athletic department tasks?

Procedures

This researcher developed a quantitative survey, *Athletic Department Task Management Survey*, designed to determine if there was a difference between principals' and athletic directors' priority of selected athletic department tasks and if there was a difference in their understanding of the time required to complete selected athletic department tasks. The selected tasks were taken from various studies and from this researcher's professional experience.

Middle school athletic directors in Richmond County, Georgia, were asked to complete the survey in order to test the reliability of the researcher-designed survey. Revisions to the survey were made as needed.

The population for this study was the principals and athletic directors of the 402 schools in the Georgia High School Association (GHSAs). A purposive random sample of 100 principals and the athletic directors who work with those principals was selected from the GHSAs member schools. There were five divisions in the GHSAs (A to AAAAA with A being the smallest classification and AAAAA being the largest classification); therefore, 20 principal and athletic director pairs were randomly selected from each division. These principals and athletic directors were sent a paper copy of the *Athletic*

Department Task Management Survey along with a self-addressed, stamped, return envelope. The initial return rate of 22% was less than impressive. Phone calls were made to the principals. Two re-occurring themes that rose out of the phone conversations were the length and the ambiguity of the survey. Revisions were made to the survey, it was re-sent via e-mail, and the response rate to the second survey was 28% for the principals and 16% for the athletic directors. The final response rates were 50% for principals and 37% for athletic directors.

The principals' answers and the athletic directors' answers concerning the priority of selected athletic department tasks were analyzed via a *t*-test to determine if there was any significant difference ($p < .05$) between the answers of the two groups. The tasks were placed in rank order based on the mean of each group's priority.

The principals' answers and the athletic directors' answers concerning the amount of time required to accomplish selected athletic department tasks were analyzed via a *t*-test to determine if there was any significant difference ($p < .05$) between the answers of the two groups. The number of days allotted to each task was determined from each group's mean start date and mean end date. The tasks were placed in rank order based on the mean number of days allotted to the tasks by each group.

The *Guide to Athletic Department Task Management* was created from the responses given by the athletic directors concerning the number of days required to start and to accomplish selected athletic department tasks. The *Guide* was sent to the participants as a token of thanks for their participation. The *Guide* was created as a spreadsheet, and formulas were imbedded into the spreadsheet so that the *Guide* could be used from year-to-year. In the future, when principals and athletic directors receive the

yearly calendar from the GHSA, they can in-put the new due dates for each task, and the *Guide* will calculate the appropriate starting date for each task. The formulas in the spreadsheet were not locked; therefore the principal and athletic director could adjust the number of days allotted for each task to suit their specific situation. The *Guide* also showed how many days should be allotted for each task. A principal or an athletic director could enter the task's due date into an electronic calendar or planner, and they could set an alarm for the suggested number of days ahead of the due date.

Data

The analysis of the survey data indicated that there was no significant difference between the responses of the principals and the responses of the athletic directors regarding the amount of time required to start and to complete selected athletic department tasks. The data did indicate that there was a significant difference in the priority that principals and athletic directors placed on completing eligibility lists and in scheduling officials. The athletic directors ranked both of these tasks at a higher priority than the principals.

There was a significant difference between the number of principals with coaching experience who provided starting dates and ending dates and those principals without coaching experience who provided starting dates and ending dates. This significant difference sparked the desire to discover why it existed. Follow-up questions were sent to the participants in an attempt to uncover the reason(s) behind the difference. The follow-up questions asked the participants if there were any tasks that they felt should have been included in the survey. The return rate for the follow-up questions was abysmal: 6% for the principals and 0% for the athletic directors. No data analysis was

attempted because of the low number of responses, and a planned interview with a principal based on the responses to the follow-up questions was abandoned. It might be worth noting that the low return rate by the athletic directors might have been impacted by the facts that the survey was conducted in September and that 38% of the athletic directors in the sample were also the school's football coach.

Major Findings

The results of the *Athletic Department Task Management Survey* showed that the only two tasks where a significant difference existed were the task of scheduling referees and the task of creating eligibility lists. Both of these tasks were rated at a higher priority by the athletic directors than the principals. Even though there was no significant difference between the priority given by principals and the priority given by athletic directors for the other tasks, the rank order of the tasks' priority was different for each group. The athletic directors consistently gave a higher priority to each task than the principals gave to the task.

The results of the *Athletic Department Task Management Survey* showed that there was no significant difference between the responses of the principals and the responses of the athletic directors as they related to the start date and the end date of the selected tasks. For seven out of the 10 tasks, the athletic directors allocated less time to start and to complete the task than did the principals. The rank order of the number of days required to complete the selected tasks as given by the principals was very close to the rank order of the number of days required to complete the task given by the athletic directors.

Discussion

Major Findings

It is interesting to note that the principals in Georgia who participated in this study had a good understanding of the priority of the various athletic department tasks, and they knew the start date and the due dates for the tasks. This finding contradicts Plutko's (2002) statement that principals have little or no background or knowledge in athletics. It is good to keep in mind that Plutko studied principals in California, and that his qualitative study had a very small number of participants. It should be noted, also, that only 50% of the principals who were asked to participate in this study actually returned their survey. It could be that the majority of those who did not return their survey had no athletic background and did not feel comfortable or qualified to complete the survey. At least two principals stated, in personal communication, that they did not have the knowledge necessary to answer the survey questions.

Relation of Findings to the Literature

Taylor (1984), Thompson (1987), Epps (1991), Basting (1990), and Anderson (1999) all studied some aspect of the roles and responsibilities of athletic directors. These individuals asked coaches, athletic directors, principals, and superintendents to indicate if a particular task was or was not an expected role or responsibility for athletic directors. The tasks selected for this study were common to the above studies, but none of these studies addressed the priority of each task. Because these studies did not address priority of tasks, they also did not investigate any type of rank order for the tasks.

Jones (1988) studied the amount of time athletic directors estimated that they spent on various athletic department tasks. Jones' study was very extensive, yet it did not

address the actual number of days spent on a task. For example, athletic directors in Jones' study stated they spent 8.52 hours a week observing coaches and 3.90 hours a week scheduling officials (p. 37). Athletic directors in this study spent 128.43 days observing coaches and scheduled officials 53.90 days in advance of the contests.

Unfortunately, there is no way to directly correlate these two sets of statistics.

Only two previous studies offered any actual time line for athletic department tasks. LeGrand (1981) suggested allowing six months for ordering uniforms, and Bucher's (1975) timeline suggested ordering equipment three months before it was needed. This survey did not address ordering uniforms, but it did ask about ordering equipment. The athletic directors' mean time for ordering equipment was 93 days, and the principals' mean time for ordering equipment was 96 days. Both of these time periods correspond favorably to Bucher's three months.

Conclusions

Based on personal experience and anecdotal observations, this researcher felt that there would be a great difference between the responses of the principals and the responses of the athletic directors regarding the amount of time required to start and to complete selected athletic department tasks. The responses on the *Athletic Department Task Management Survey* proved differently. It would appear that principals had both a good understanding of the priority of the selected tasks and a good understanding of the amount of time required to start and to complete those tasks.

Priority of Tasks

The lack of significant difference between the principals' responses and the athletic directors' responses might be attributed to the fact that 68% of the principals who

participated in this study had coaching experience. That there was a significant difference between the principals and the athletic directors concerning eligibility lists and scheduling officials is somewhat puzzling. Maybe the principals had been off of the sidelines long enough to have forgotten the importance of good officials, and maybe the importance the GHSA placed on eligibility was lost in the minutia of being a principal.

Rank Order of Tasks

With the exception of Task Number 8: Evaluating Coaches, the athletic directors gave each task a higher priority than did the principals. Creating a Budget, Completing Eligibility Lists, and Scheduling Physicals were in the top four tasks for both principals and for athletic directors. These three tasks ranked 1, 2 and 4 on the principals' list and 4, 1, and 2 on the athletic directors' list, respectively. It could well be that athletic directors placed a higher priority on eligibility and on physicals because they knew the GHSA placed a high priority on eligibility and on physicals.

Start and Due Date for Each Task

The fact that there was no significant difference between the principals' responses and the athletic directors' responses concerning priority of eight of the selected athletic department tasks was not a complete surprise. One would think that the principals and athletic directors communicated concerning the completion of these tasks, and that they shared with each other which tasks were the most important. It was quite surprising to find that there was no significant difference between the responses given by the principals and the responses given by the athletic directors over the amount of time required to start and to complete the selected athletic department tasks. In casual conversations with principals and athletic directors during the preparations for this study,

most felt that principals were not aware of the time athletic directors spend on the various tasks. It would seem that the career path of the majority (68%) of the principals in this study equipped them with this knowledge. Thirty-two percent (16 out of 50) of the principals in this study had no coaching experience. Seventy-six percent (13 out of 17) of those principals without coaching experience did not provide the start date or the due date for the selected tasks. It certainly appeared that their lack of coaching experience prevented them from offering these dates. On the other hand, it could well be that they were conscientious and did not want to adversely impact the outcome of this study. The follow-up questions could have shown a light on this topic, but they were not answered.

Rank Order of the Number of Days Allocated for Each Task

The rank order of the number of days allocated for each task showed much less variation than the rank order for the priority of the tasks. This was quite a surprise, also. Observation and Evaluation, Creating a Budget, Eligibility Lists, Scheduling Practice Facilities, and Scheduling Transportation had the same rank for both groups (1, 5, 7, 9, and 10) even though the principals allotted more time to each task, with the exception of eligibility lists, than the athletic directors allotted. It would appear that the principals' experience in the field of coaching had helped them become aware of the number of days required to start and to complete various athletic department tasks.

Recommendations

Whereas it appears that the high school principals in the State of Georgia have an excellent handle on the amount of time needed to start and to complete athletic department tasks, it should be noted that 32% of the principals who participated in the survey did not have any coaching experience. Additionally, 76% of those principals did

not give any start dates and end dates. It seems as if the principals without a background in coaching are the individuals who could most use the *Guide to Athletic Department Task Management*.

Practice

The information gained through this study would be quite useful for principals in the following situations: new to their school/system/state, hiring a new athletic director, having to mentor an unorganized athletic director, and/or being without an athletic director for any length of time.

In personal conversations with several principals, it was discovered that two aspects of the principalship were a shock for them to learn: they were on call 24/7 and that they were responsible for everything. For principals who are new to their school, the system, or the state, this document can serve as a resource as they attempt to oversee the athletic department. One principal who participated in this study stated that he intended to begin using the *Guide to Athletic Department Task Management* this year.

If principals stay at their school long enough, they will eventually hire an athletic director. The information gained in this study can be used by a principal as a tool for guiding the athletic director as she/he leads the athletic department. It is hoped that all hires are good hires, and that all people are good at what they do, but people do have strengths and weaknesses. In the event that an athletic director is not proficient at organization and time management, this information can be used by the principal to develop a professional improvement plan for the athletic director.

Principals might find themselves in the position of being without an athletic director. The reasons for this situation could be sickness, military service, or employment

strife that causes the athletic director to be fired or to simply quit. The information contained in the *Guide to Athletic Department Task Management* will help the principal keep the athletic department on task during this time.

The information gained through this study would be quite useful for athletic directors in the following situations: new to their school/system/state, struggling with time management, or training assistant athletic directors.

Although some due dates for various tasks are set by the state, an athletic director moving to a new high school within the state will still face due dates that are specific to their system. Athletic directors in such a situation can use the *Guide* in their new system.

Some individuals are time management challenged. The results of this study can be used to help individual athletic directors complete their tasks on time.

Athletic directors with a great deal of experience can use the *Guide to Athletic Department Task Management* as a tool to train their assistant athletic directors or younger coaches who aspire to become an athletic director.

Policy

The results of this study should have little impact on policy. Principals are already responsible for the total operation of the school, and athletic directors are already responsible for the smooth functioning of their department. It might be necessary to remind principals of their responsibility as it relates to the athletic department.

Preparation

Colleges and universities include courses in their administration/leadership programs that address the many aspects of the principalship. Courses covering finance, budgeting, organization and administration, and leadership are included in the

curriculum. This researcher learned about the principal's responsibility relating to money management in the front office, in the media center, and in the lunchroom while pursuing an Ed. S. While pursuing this terminal degree, various organizational structures were studied, and many different leadership styles were presented. Yet, at no time was there any discussion of the program in schools that has the largest budget, the largest staff, and the greatest impact on the school community – the athletic department. As individuals learn to become educational leaders, they should be exposed to athletic department operations and the impact of athletics on the school.

While earning a Masters' degree in Athletic Administration at Georgia State University, this researcher learned how to make a budget, how to order equipment, the importance of facility safety, and many other concepts that were pertinent to the successful operation of an athletic department. None of the courses or portion of the courses addressed time/task management. Ordering equipment via a bid process was taught, but how far in advance to start the bid process was not mentioned. The importance of athletic physicals was stressed, but the time required to schedule the physicals and to notify the student and parents was not addressed. Eligibility and the importance of eligibility to the GHSA were taught, but the time required to gather eligibility information, to complete the eligibility lists, and to mail the eligibility list to the state office was never covered. Colleges offering degrees in Athletic Administration should include an entire course on the topic of task/time management. If it is not feasible to offer an entire course on this topic, then the topic should be addressed in either the introduction to athletic administration course or in the organization and administration of athletics course.

Potential Future Studies

A greater percentage of principals without coaching experience did not provide starting and ending dates than those principals with coaching experience. A future study might investigate principals' beliefs concerning the impact of their experience or lack of experience in the field of athletics as it relates to their responsibility towards the athletic department and their relationship with the athletic director.

The survey in this study provided a list of various tasks and asked the principals and athletic directors to assign a priority and to indicate the start date and the end date for accomplishing those tasks. It might be beneficial to ask principals and athletic directors to list their top 10 athletic department tasks and to include the amount of days required to accomplish each task. It is quite possible that the tasks generated from such a study would be completely different from the tasks used in this study.

Two out of the 45 principals contacted by phone mentioned they receive 5 to 15 surveys a week. A study might be conducted to determine if principals feel that they are overwhelmed with survey requests and if they have any suggestions for future doctoral candidates in regards to gathering dissertation information.

Twenty-two out of 100 principals (22%) responded to the request to participate in the survey when the request was sent as a hard copy through the USPS. Twenty-eight out of 45 principals (62%) responded to the request to participate in the survey when the survey was sent as an electronic document via e-mail. A study could be conducted in an attempt to determine the most successful technique to use when conducting a quantitative survey. It would appear from this study that an electronic survey might be more successful than the traditional paper based survey.

This study was conducted with the principals and athletic directors of the GHSA member schools. It might be beneficial to conduct this study with principals and athletic directors from other athletic associations within the State of Georgia. Additionally, this study could be conducted in other states to determine if the region of the country has any impact on the priority given to each task and the amount of time required to start and to complete various athletic department tasks.

Closing Remarks

Sadly, one principal and athletic director pair which participated in the survey did not apply the knowledge they had concerning completing and turning in eligibility lists. The athletic director (new to the State of Georgia) did not complete the task of sending an eligibility list to the GHSA; the principal (who had no coaching experience) did not follow up with the athletic director concerning this task; the school received a hefty fine from the GHSA; and the athletic director lost his job.

An attempt will be made to present the findings of this study and the *Guide* at both the Georgia Athletic Directors Association's Conference in April of 2009 and the Georgia Association of Educational Leaders' Summer Conference in July of 2009. A condensed version of the *Guide to Athletic Department Task Management* will be sent to *Scholastic Coach and Athletic Director* in an attempt to have it published in the A.D.MINISTRATION column.

REFERENCES

- Basting, C. H. (1990). Role expectations of athletic directors of Class A public high schools in the State of Wisconsin. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin – Madison, 1990).
- Bouillette, A. C. (1996). An analysis of selected aspects of the role of high school principals in the Chicago-land area in light of leadership orientation. (Doctoral dissertation, Loyola University of Chicago, 1996).
- Boyd, M. L. (2002). School choice: perceptions of magnet schools and charter school principals and parents in Georgia. (Doctoral dissertation, Georgia Southern University, 2002).
- Broyles, J. F. (1979). *Administration of athletic programs: a managerial approach*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Bucher, C. A. (1975). *Administration of health and physical education programs, including athletics*. Saint Louis, MO: Mosby.
- Cheverus High School Athletic Manual*. (2003). Retrieved October 25, 2003, from <http://www.cheverus.org/athletics/handbook/default.asp>
- Creswell, J. W. (2003). *Research design, qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Colson, R. (2007). Elementary teacher mentoring in a rural Georgia system: the impact on teacher retention and the implication for elementary school principals. (Doctoral dissertation, Georgia Southern University, 2007).

- Council of Chief State School Officers. (1996). *Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium's standards for school leaders*. Retrieved January 27, 2007 from <http://www.ccsso.org/content/pdfs/isllestd.pdf>
- Cox, S. (2002). *Athletics in Rural America*. Abstract retrieved December 1, 2003, from <http://agriculture.truman.edu/research/shcox.htm>
- Denney, C. A. (Ed.). (1986). *Harrison Chilhowee Baptist Academy athletic department coaches' and sponsors' manual*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Denney, C. A. (Ed.). (1987). *San Antonio Christian Schools athletic department manual*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Emery, D. C. (1978). *Handbook for high school athletic directors*. Bellingham, WA: E & E Publishers.
- Epps, M. B. (1991). The importance of the role of Detroit's high school athletic directors as perceived by principals, assistant principals, athletic directors, and head coaches. (Doctoral dissertation, Wayne State University, 1991).
- Forsythe, C. E. (1956). *The athletic director's handbook: for athletic directors and facility managers*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Forsythe, C. E., & Keller, I. A. (1972). *Administration of high school athletics* (5th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Gabrielsen, M. A. & Miles, C. M. (Eds.). (1958). *Sports and recreation facilities for school and community*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Geocaris, C. M. (2004). The evolving role of the principalship: Critical insights for a new paradigm. (Doctoral dissertation, Northern Illinois University, 2004).

- George, J. F. & Lehmann, H. A. (1966). *School athletic administration; a textbook for professional students and a guide for local athletic directors*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.
- Georgia High School Association. (2007). *Athletics*. Retrieved on March 17, 2007 from <http://www.ghsa.net/?q=node/47&page=0%2C0>
- Georgia High School Association. (2007). *Member schools directory*. Thomaston, GA: Georgia High School Association.
- Georgia Professional Standards Commission (2006). *The Georgia educator workforce 2006. A report of the supply, demand, and utilization of teachers, administrative, and student services personnel in Georgia public schools*. Retrieved on October 31, 2007 from http://www.gapsc.com/Workforce/2006_Report/Full_Report.pdf
- Glesne, C. (1999). *Becoming qualitative researchers. An introduction*. (2nd ed.). New York: Longman.
- Griffin, J. H. (1967). *The new athletic director's handbook*. Danville, IL: School Aid Company.
- Gritton, L. A. (Ed.). (2001). *Athletic handbook 2001-2002 Curtis Baptist School*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Gunsten, P. H. (1978). *Tournament scheduling the easy way*. Winston-Salem, NC: Hunter Textbooks, Inc.
- Healey, W. A. (1961). *The administration of high school athletic events*. Danville. IL: Interstate.

- Henderson, M. C. (2002). Beginning principals' self-perceptions of administrative task proficiencies in Georgia elementary schools. (Doctoral dissertation, Georgia Southern University, 2002).
- Howard, B. and Gillis, J. (2006). *Participation in high school sports increases again; confirms NFHS commitment to stronger leadership*. Retrieved January 29, 2007 from http://www.nfhs.org/web/2006/09/participation_in_high_school_sports_increases_again_confirms_nf.aspx
- Hughes, L. M. (2006). Georgia elementary principals' perceptions of their ethical philosophy, formal leadership preparation in ethics, and actions related to the development and maintenance of an ethical school. (Doctoral dissertation, Georgia Southern University, 2006).
- Jones, C. W. (1988). An investigation of the perceptions of time use by department heads/athletic directors in Philadelphia public secondary schools. (Doctoral dissertation, Temple University, 1988).
- Kelly, K. J. (2003). Perceptions of the roles and responsibilities of the secondary principal. (Doctoral dissertation, Immaculata College, 2003).
- Kerlinger, F. N. and Lee, H. B. (2000). *Foundations of behavioral research* (4th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

- Kjeldskov, J. and Graham, C. (2003). A review of mobile HCI research methods. *Human-computer interaction with mobile devices and services*. Retrieved on December 22, 2007 from http://books.google.com/books?id=cgyZXINY5q8C&pg=PA321&lpg=PA321&dq=%22advantages+of+surveys%22&source=web&ots=ZX1Z315K_P&sig=qYhV-hJV1RLe8g1U-s2Tt9053Rk#PPP1,M1
- LeGrand, S. C. (1981). *A handbook for first-year athletic directors in Minnesota*. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Minnesota at St. Cloud.
- Marriner, N. R. (2007). *Above average ability, creativity and self-efficacy as predictors of success for honors students*. Abstract DAI-A 67/11, May 2007. Retrieved on May 1, 2007 from ProQuest.
- Masteralexis, L. P., Barr, C. A., & Hums, M. A. (1998). *Principles and practice of sport management*. Gaithersburg, MD: Aspen Publishers.
- Motulsky, H. (2004). *GraphPad*. Retrieved on October 10, 2007 from <http://www.graphpad.com/quickcalcs/ttest1.cfm>
- National Policy Board for Educational Administration (2002). *Educational Leadership Constituent Council's standards for advanced programs in educational leadership*. Retrieved on January 26, 2007 from http://www.npbea.org/ELCC/ELCCStandards%20_5-02.pdf
- Ohio State Board of Education, (2005). *Ohio standards for principals*. Retrieved on January 27, 2007 from http://esb.ode.state.oh.us/Word/Oh_Standards_ForPrinc_FINAL_10_31_06.doc

- Parkhouse, B. L. (Ed.). (1996). *The management of sports. Its foundation and application*. (2nd Ed.). St. Louis, MO: Mosby.
- Parks, J. B. & Quarterman, J. (Eds.). (2003). *Contemporary sport management*. (2nd Ed.). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Plutko, G. S. (2002). Principals, high school athletics and the CIF: A case study. (Doctoral dissertation, University of La Verne, 2002).
- Richmond County Board of Education, (2006). *Athletic manual*. Unpublished document.
- Robb, C. M. (2002). *Can the poor influence policy? Participatory poverty assessments in the developing world* (2nd ed.). Washington: The World Bank. Retrieved on December 22, 2007 from http://publications.worldbank.org/catalog/content-download?revision_id=1103374
- Rudestam, K. E. and Newton, R. R. (2000). *Surviving your dissertation: a comprehensive guide to content and process*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications
- Sacred Heart Academy Athletic Handbook*. (2002). Retrieved October 31, 2003, from <http://www.sacredheartacad.com/athletics/athleticpolicies.shtml>
- Taylor, F. R. (1984). A profile of athletic directors in the public schools of Arkansas with guide for developing a model job description. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Arkansas, 1984).
- The Hewlett School: Athletic Department Handbook*. (1996). Retrieved October 10, 2003, from <http://www.rpi.edu/dept/lc/webclass/web/filigree/westmorlandahandbook.html>

- Thompson, J. C. (1987). Role-expectations of the athletic director as perceived by athletic directors, superintendents, and principals in the State of Texas. (Doctoral dissertation, University of North Texas, 1987).
- Trochim, W. M. K. (2006). *Research methods knowledge base*. Retrieved on December 22, 2007 from <http://www.socialresearchmethods.net/kb/samprnon.php>
- Urbaniak, G.C., and Plous, S. (2007). Research Randomizer (Version 3.0) [Computer software]. Retrieved September 1, 2007 from <http://randomizer.org>
- Weiner, S. M. (1979). Legal responsibilities vs. legal authority of school principals. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Nevada - Las Vegas, 1979).
- Yarborough, J. T. (2002). Georgia High school principals' perceptions of inclusion. (Doctoral dissertation, Georgia Southern University, 2002).

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A
RESPONSIBILITIES AND ROLES OF PRINCIPALS

Boyd 2002	Bouillette 1996	Colson 2007	Geocariss 2004	Hughes 2006
Marketing	Instructional Leader <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Curriculum and instruction improvement • Creating school climate • Teacher evaluation and staff development Educational Manager <i>Researcher's Note: Bouillette offered no sub-points for this category</i> Communicator	Mentoring <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support mentoring • Advocate the importance of mentoring 	Managerial <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Building operations • Maintenance • Safety • Security • Budget • Expenditures • Student discipline and support services Instructional <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leadership • Curriculum development • Curriculum selection • Personnel evaluation 	Develop an ethical school Maintain an ethical school

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Oral and written• Two-way - relational• One-way - task		<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Hiring Political• Interpret board policies• Leadership in parent organizations• Community service• Membership in professional organizations	
--	--	--	---	--

Henderson 2002	Kelly 2003	Plutko 2002	Weiner 1979	Yarborough 2002
<p>Management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Being visible and accessible throughout the school • Establishing clear expectations for use of classroom time • Understanding technical areas of principalship • Budgeting • Acquiring resources • Maintaining facilities <p>Personnel duties</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recruiting and 	<p>Provide instructional leadership</p> <p>Lead instructional improvement</p> <p>Establish appropriate learning environment</p> <p>Provide direction to students</p> <p>Recognize the need of all students</p> <p>Seek solutions for educational problems</p>	<p>Oversee athletic department</p> <p>Maintain eligibility standards</p> <p>Deal with parents</p> <p>Hire coaches</p> <p>Communicate with athletic staff</p> <p>Evaluate the athletic staff</p>	<p>Task 1: School Community</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meet with community leaders • Disseminate information • Report pupil progress • Attend public meetings • Ascertain feedback <p>Task 2: Curriculum and Instruction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plan and implement instructional 	<p>Facilitate the inclusion of special needs students into the general education classroom</p>

Henderson 2002	Kelly 2003	Plutko 2002	Weiner 1979	Yarborough 2002
selecting personnel <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff development • Intervention strategies for ineffective teachers • Supervision and evaluating staff • Helping staff with professional goals • Recruiting and selecting personnel • Staff development • Intervention 	Establish and enforce discipline Involve members of the school community Motivate teachers to improve Guide staff development Foster teamwork Rely of research to establish policy Develop consensus for goals Foster school		program <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide teacher in-service • Selection of instructional materials • Evaluation of curriculum Task 3: Pupil Personnel <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pupil inventory • Pupil accounting • Pupil services • Control pupil behavior Task 4: Staff Personnel	

Henderson 2002	Kelly 2003	Plutko 2002	Weiner 1979	Yarborough 2002
<p>strategies for ineffective teachers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supervision and evaluating staff • Helping staff with professional goals <p>Leadership</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Working with the culture for the school • Developing collaborative skills • Creating a climate of trust • Motivating towards goals 	<p>community support for programs</p> <p>Maintain open lines of communication</p> <p>Inspire community to accomplish school's mission</p> <p>Set high expectations for the school</p> <p>Identify objectives for success</p> <p>Assess school effectiveness</p> <p>Respond to</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Securing personnel • Encouraging personnel • Appraise personnel <p>Task 4: Staff</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop personnel practices <p>Task 5:</p> <p>Physical Facilities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oversee building • Oversee grounds • Oversee equipment • Oversee buses 	

Henderson 2002	Kelly 2003	Plutko 2002	Weiner 1979	Yarborough 2002
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pupil Personnel • Handling discipline problems • Create a support program • Communicate with parents • Plan student activities • Promote attendance School - Community • Effective media relations • Working with various parts of the school community 	<p>the needs of the faculty</p> <p>Guide use of financial resources</p> <p>Make decisions</p>		<p>Task 6:</p> <p>Finance and Business Management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Budget making • Secure revenues • Manage expenditures 	

APPENDIX B
RESPONSIBILITIES AND ROLES OF ATHLETIC DIRECTORS

Anderson 1999	Basting 1990	Epps 1991
<p>Planning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deciding which sports to offer • Hiring coaches • Arranging facility usage • Arranging funding <p>Arranging and planning for games</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scheduling games • Contracting game officials • Publicizing program activities • Supervising contests • Arranging game staff: tickets, concessions, security, and/or parking • Preparing facilities <p>Working with coaching staff</p>	<p>Inform students, parents, and teachers of the athletic code</p> <p>Maintain records of code violations</p> <p>Inform coaches of their responsibilities</p> <p>Hire new coaches</p> <p>Supervise and evaluate coaches</p> <p>Dismiss coaches</p> <p>Maintain eligibility</p> <p>Keep records of athletic awards</p> <p>Schedule facilities</p> <p>Schedule contests</p> <p>Serve as school representative in athletic district</p> <p>Serve as school</p>	<p>Business management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construct budget • Administer budget • Plan facilities usage • Maintain facilities • Supervise contests • Supervise athletic accounts • Purchase, distribute, and inventory supplies and equipment <p>Personnel</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommend hiring • Select coaches • Evaluate coaches • Supervise coaches • Determine number of coaches needed <p>Community relations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Directing use of facilities

Anderson 1999	Basting 1990	Epps 1991
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting with coaches • Planning for road trips • Travel with teams • Work with coaches on long rang planning <p>Duties related to the athletes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arrange for physicals • Arrange for insurance • Maintain records of injuries, eligibility, and awards • Maintain training equipment and supplies <p>Budget and fiscal maters</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prepare and manage budget • Authorize expenditures • Overseeing fund raising • Supervise accounting <p>Personnel</p>	<p>representative in state's athletic association</p> <p>Supervise home contests</p> <p>Arrange for contest staff: ticket takers, concession staff, medical staff, and security</p> <p>Contract with game officials</p> <p>Arrange for away game transportation</p> <p>Order and inventory equipment</p> <p>Serve as liaison between athletes and recruiting coaches</p> <p>Prepare and present budget</p> <p>Sign game contracts</p> <p>Serve as athletic department public relations representative</p> <p>Serve as liaison with community</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Handling criticisms of the athletic program • Working with community organizations • Planning a public relations program <p>Administrative</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review program: drop or add sports • Schedule games • Sign game contracts • Make policy recommendations • Control athletes' behavior • Set ethical standards • Direct PE program • Direct driver's ed program • Arrange contest staff: tickets, concessions,

Anderson 1999	Basting 1990	Epps 1991
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommend hiring, promotions, and dismissals • Supervise and evaluate coaches • Provide in-service for coaches • Prepare facilities for contests • Conduct safety checks on equipment and facilities • Supervise facility maintenance • Schedule equipment repair <p>Public relations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plan publicity activities • Speak to civic groups • Provide information to media 	<p>Monitor the athletic insurance program</p> <p>Plan coaches' in-service</p>	<p>safety</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supervise athletic program <p>Additional responsibilities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teach classes • Various "Teacher duties:" lunch room, bus, and/or hall • Serve as liaison for booster club • Check and certify eligibility forms • Maintain records • Conduct awards banquet

Anderson 1999	Basting 1990	Epps 1991
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plan publicity activities • Represent athletic department to civic groups • Provide information to media <p>Miscellaneous</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Serve on faculty committees • Keep principal and teachers informed • Represent school in region and state organizations 		

Jones 1988	Taylor 1984	Thompson 1987
<p>Supervision of teachers and coaches</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Observe teachers and coaches • Evaluate teacher and coaches • Conference with teachers and coaches <p>Personal teaching</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teaching physical education classes • Teaching health education classes <p>General administration</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requisition books and supplies • Plan rosters for teachers • Provide class coverage • Resolve discipline problems 	<p>Policy Development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitor operation of the athletic program • Develop and recommend new policies <p>Budget and Finance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prepare budget • Handle the sale of ads for the athletic program • Handle the sale of the program at athletic contests <p>Equipment and Facilities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coordinate schedule of facilities for practice • Approve schedules for all sports • Maintain equipment inventory <p>Equipment and Facilities</p>	<p>Program coordinator</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work with building principal on programs offered • Work with principal on schedules • Consult with coaches concerning athletic plans • Consult with coaches over schedule changes • Cooperate with school personnel concerning the athletic program <p>Schedule physical exams</p> <p>Policy development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recognizes athletes as students first and athletes second • Recognizes coaches as teachers first and coaches

Jones 1988	Taylor 1984	Thompson 1987
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General record keeping: grades, lesson plans • Schedule athletic assembly • Arrange for awards for athletes • Order athletic equipment • Field maintenance • Schedule transportation • Handle postponements • Review eligibility rules • Plan fundraising activities • Schedule officials • Schedule security • Address press relations Curriculum leadership • Have parent conferences • Coordinate guest speakers • Share new trends in teaching • Provide in-service training 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oversee all equipment purchases Personnel • Maintain athletic award records • Check and verify all eligibility forms • Maintain records of athletic program • Provide consultative assistant to coaches as needed • Recommend hiring new coaches • Meet with athletic staff regularly • Responsible for safety Transportation • Coordinate travel for all teams • Secure travel funds 	<p>second</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitors title IX compliance • Participates in professional organizations • Enforces state association regulations <p>Game management and financial responsibilities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administer game management: ticket takers, announcers, public safety, other staff as needed • Contract with officials • Account for gate receipts • Arrange transportation for away games • Schedule use of facilities • Provide guidelines for booster club operation

Jones 1988	Taylor 1984	Thompson 1987
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review curriculum guidelines for Physical Education and Health Education Professional meetings representing the department • Attend cabinet meetings • Attend supervisory meetings Miscellaneous • Submit annual report to principal • Evaluate athletic program • Insure athletic program complies with region and state guidelines and regulations 	<p>Contest Management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Secure contract for officials • Pay officials • Secure contest staff <p>Public Relations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Serve as liaison with booster club • Responsible for issuing season passes • Communicate role of athletic director to community and staff <p>Miscellaneous</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submit annual report to principal • Evaluate athletic program • Insure athletic program complies with region and state guidelines and regulations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop budget • Order and distribute equipment • Understand legal responsibilities • Provide in-service for coaches Personnel • Recruit coaches • Recruit coaches • Recommend hiring, promoting, or dismissal of coaches • Consult with principal over hiring and firing • Make decisions concerning coaching duties • Delegates responsibilities to coaches • Organize in-service

APPENDIX C

ATHLETIC DEPARTMENT TASK MANAGEMENT SURVEY

Athletic Department Task Management Survey

Please return this survey in the stamped envelope provided. Feel free to make comments concerning the survey questions, the survey's layout, or additional tasks that should be included in future surveys.

I. Demographic Data:

1. Gender: _____
2. Age: _____
3. Position you hold (please circle): P P/AD AP AP/AD AD
4. Years of coaching experience: _____
5. Years of administrative (Assistant Principal or Principal) experience: _____
6. Years at your current school: _____
7. Years in the field of education: _____
8. Size of your school (please circle): A AA AAA AAAA AAAAA

II. Survey

Please circle the priority you assign to each task. Category 1 represents tasks with the lowest priority while Category 5 represents those tasks with the highest priority. Please put the due date and the start date in the spaces provided. Please use dates that are appropriate for the 2007-2008 school year. An example is below:

Schedule contest staff: concessions, tickets, security, safety...

Priority 1 2 3 4 5

Sport	Date schedule is created.			Date schedule is needed.		
	Month/Day/Year			Month/Day/Year		
Football	08	15	07	08	31	07
Cross Country	08	05	07	08	20	07
Basketball	11	02	07	11	17	07
Wrestling	11	05	07	11	19	07
Baseball	02	10	08	02	25	08
Golf	02	03	08	02	18	08

1. Creating a Budget

Priority 1 2 3 4 5

Date budget process is started.			Date budget is due.		
Month/Day/Year			Month/Day/Year		

2. Ordering Equipment

Priority	1	2	3	4	5	
Sport	Date the equipment is ordered. Month/Day/Year			Date the equipment is needed. Month/Day/Year		
Football						
Cross Country						
Basketball						
Wrestling						
Baseball						
Golf						

3. Scheduling Athletic Contests

Priority	1	2	3	4	5	
Sport	Date scheduling process is started. Month/Day/Year			Date schedule needs to be finalized. Month/Day/Year		
Football						
Cross Country						
Basketball						
Wrestling						
Baseball						
Golf						

4. Obtaining Game Contracts

Priority	1	2	3	4	5	
Sport	Date contract process is started. Month/Day/Year			Date contract process needs to be finalized. Month/Day/Year		
Football						
Cross Country						
Basketball						
Wrestling						
Baseball						
Golf						

5. Scheduling Referees

Priority	1	2	3	4	5	
Sport	Date referee schedules are started. Month/Day/Year			Date referee schedules need to be finalized. Month/Day/Year		
Football						
Cross Country						
Basketball						
Wrestling						
Baseball						
Golf						

6. Scheduling Contest Transportation

Priority	1	2	3	4	5	
Sport	Date transportation request forms are filled-out. Month/Day/Year			Date transportation request forms are due to Transportation. Month/Day/Year		
Football						
Cross Country						
Basketball						
Wrestling						
Baseball						
Golf						

7. Eligibility Lists

Priority	1	2	3	4	5	
Sport	Date eligibility list is created. Month/Day/Year			Date eligibility list is due at the GHSA office. Month/Day/Year		
Football						
Cross Country						
Basketball						
Wrestling						
Baseball						
Golf						

8. Observing and Evaluating Coaches

Priority 1 2 3 4 5

Sport	Date observations and evaluations are started. Month/Day/Year			Date observations and evaluations are due. Month/Day/Year		
Football						
Cross Country						
Basketball						
Wrestling						
Baseball						
Golf						

9. Scheduling the use of practice facilities

Priority 1 2 3 4 5

Sport	Date practice facility schedule is created. Month/Day/Year			Date practice facility schedule is needed. Month/Day/Year		
Football						
Cross Country						
Basketball						
Wrestling						
Baseball						
Golf						

10. Schedule physicals for athletes

Priority 1 2 3 4 5

Sport	Date the students and parents are notified concerning physicals. Month/Day/Year			Date the physicals are given. Month/Day/Year		
Football						
Cross Country						
Basketball						
Wrestling						
Baseball						
Golf						

APPENDIX D
PRINCIPALS' COVER LETTER

Art Denney
1016 Holiday Drive
North Augusta, SC 29841
September 10, 2007

XXX
XXX
XXX
XXX

Dear Mr. XXX:

I am in the doctoral program at Georgia Southern University, pursuing an Ed. D. in Educational Leadership. Enclosed, is a survey I designed to evaluate the differences in principals' experiences and athletic directors' experiences as they relate to athletic department tasks. Your school was randomly selected from a list of the Georgia High School Association membership. I would be very grateful if you and your athletic director agree to participate in this study. Please be assured that your identity will be protected, and that you may drop out of the study at any time with no consequences to you, to your athletic director, or to your school.

There is a copy of the survey for you and a copy of the survey for your athletic director. The integrity of the survey depends on you and your athletic director taking the survey without consulting each other. Please return the survey before September 28th in the envelopes provided. My goal is to make the final defense of my dissertation by November 1st. If you would like a copy of the survey's results, then please return the post card that is included in the packet. In order to maintain your anonymity, please return the card separately from your survey.

Thank you so much for helping me in this matter.

Sincerely,

Art Denney

APPENDIX E
REVISED PRINCIPALS' SURVEY

Athletic Department Task Management Survey

Please return this survey by attaching it to an e-mail message. Feel free to make comments concerning the survey questions, the survey's layout, or additional tasks that should be included in future surveys.

I. Demographic Data: Please enter your information in the space provided. For *Position* and *Size of School*, please put an X in the block below the correct category.

1. Gender					
2. Age					
3. Position	P	P/AD			
5. Years of coaching experience:					
6. Years of athletic administration experience (principal or assistant principal)					
7. Years at your current school:					
8. Years in education:					
9. Size of your school:	A	AA	AAA	AAAA	AAAAA

II. Survey

Please place parentheses around the priority you assign to each task. Category 1 represents tasks with the lowest priority while Category 5 represents those tasks with the highest priority. Please put the due date and the start date in the spaces provided. Please use dates that are appropriate for the 2007-2008 school year. An example is below:

Schedule contest staff: concessions, tickets, security, safety...

Priority 1 2 3 4 (5)

Sport	Date schedule is created.			Date schedule is needed.		
	Month/Day/Year			Month/Day/Year		
Football	08	15	07	08	31	07
Basketball	11	02	07	11	17	07
Wrestling	11	05	07	11	19	07
Baseball	02	10	08	02	25	08
Comments	The booster club provides contest staff. The county's public safety department provides security.					

If it is more convenient for you, please feel free to indicate the number of days the task is started before its due date. For example, “Three months; Two weeks; Ten days before first contest ...”

1. Creating a Budget

Priority 1 2 3 4 5

Date budget process is started. Month/Day/Year			Date budget is due. Month/Day/Year		
Comments					

2. Ordering Equipment

Priority 1 2 3 4 5

Sport	Date the equipment is ordered. Month/Day/Year			Date the equipment is needed. Month/Day/Year		
Football						
Basketball						
Baseball						
Comments						

3. Scheduling Athletic Contests

Priority 1 2 3 4 5

Sport	Date scheduling process is started. Month/Day/Year			Date schedules need to be finalized. Month/Day/Year		
Football						
Basketball						
Baseball						
Comments						

4. Obtaining Game Contracts

Priority 1 2 3 4 5

Sport	Date contract process is started. Month/Day/Year			Date contract process needs to be finalized. Month/Day/Year		
Football						
Basketball						
Baseball						
Comments						

5. Scheduling Referees

Priority 1 2 3 4 5

Sport	Date referee schedules are started. Month/Day/Year			Date referee schedules need to be finalized. Month/Day/Year		
Football						
Basketball						
Baseball						
Comments						

6. Scheduling Contest Transportation

Priority 1 2 3 4 5

Sport	Date transportation request forms are filled-out. Month/Day/Year			Date transportation request forms are due to Transportation. Month/Day/Year		
Football						
Basketball						
Baseball						
Comments						

7. Eligibility Lists

Priority 1 2 3 4 5

Sport	Date eligibility list is created. Month/Day/Year			Date eligibility list is due at the GHSA office. Month/Day/Year		
Football						
Basketball						
Baseball						
Comments						

8. Observing and Evaluating Coaches

Priority 1 2 3 4 5

Sport	Date observations and evaluations are started. Month/Day/Year			Date observations and evaluations are due. Month/Day/Year		
Football						
Basketball						
Baseball						
Comments						

9. Scheduling the use of practice facilities

Priority 1 2 3 4 5

Sport	Date practice facility schedule is created. Month/Day/Year			Date practice facility schedule is needed. Month/Day/Year		
Football						
Basketball						
Baseball						
Comments						

10. Schedule physicals for athletes

Priority 1 2 3 4 5

Sport	Date the students and parents are notified concerning physicals. Month/Day/Year			Date the physicals are given. Month/Day/Year		
Football						
Basketball						
Baseball						
Comments						

Additional Comments and Suggestions:

APPENDIX F
REVISED ATHLETIC DIRECTORS' SURVEY

Athletic Department Task Management Survey

Please return this survey by attaching it to an e-mail message. Feel free to make comments concerning the survey questions, the survey's layout, or additional tasks that should be included in future surveys.

I. Demographic Data: Please enter your information in the space provided. For *Position* and *Size of School*, please put an X in the block below the correct category.

1. Gender					
2. Age					
3. Position	AP/AD	AD			
5. Years of coaching experience:					
6. Years of athletic administration experience (AD or Assistant AD)					
7. Years at your current school:					
8. Years in education:					
9. Size of your school:	A	AA	AAA	AAAA	AAAAA

II. Survey

Please place parentheses around the priority you assign to each task. Category 1 represents tasks with the lowest priority while Category 5 represents those tasks with the highest priority. Please put the due date and the start date in the spaces provided. Please use dates that are appropriate for the 2007-2008 school year. An example is below:

Schedule contest staff: concessions, tickets, security, safety...

Priority 1 2 3 4 (5)

Sport	Date schedule is created.			Date schedule is needed.		
	Month/Day/Year			Month/Day/Year		
Football	08	15	07	08	31	07
Basketball	11	02	07	11	17	07
Baseball	02	10	08	02	25	08

If it is more convenient for you, please feel free to indicate the number of days the task is started before its due date. For example, "Three months; Two weeks; Ten days before first contest ..."

1. Creating a Budget

Priority 1 2 3 4 5

Date budget process is started. Month/Day/Year			Date budget is due. Month/Day/Year		
Comments					

2. Ordering Equipment

Priority 1 2 3 4 5

Sport	Date the equipment is ordered. Month/Day/Year			Date the equipment is needed. Month/Day/Year		
	Football					
Basketball						
Baseball						
Comments						

3. Scheduling Athletic Contests

Priority 1 2 3 4 5

Sport	Date scheduling process is started. Month/Day/Year			Date schedule needs to be finalized. Month/Day/Year		
	Football					
Basketball						
Baseball						
Comments						

4. Obtaining Game Contracts

Priority 1 2 3 4 5

Sport	Date contract process is started. Month/Day/Year			Date contract process needs to be finalized. Month/Day/Year		
	Football					
Basketball						
Baseball						
Comments						

5. Scheduling Referees

Priority 1 2 3 4 5

Sport	Date referee schedules are started. Month/Day/Year			Date referee schedules need to be finalized. Month/Day/Year		
Football						
Basketball						
Baseball						
Comments						

6. Scheduling Contest Transportation

Priority 1 2 3 4 5

Sport	Date transportation request forms are filled-out. Month/Day/Year			Date transportation request forms are due to Transportation. Month/Day/Year		
Football						
Basketball						
Baseball						
Comments						

7. Eligibility Lists

Priority 1 2 3 4 5

Sport	Date eligibility list is created. Month/Day/Year			Date eligibility list is due at the GHSA office. Month/Day/Year		
Football						
Basketball						
Baseball						
Comments						

8. Observing and Evaluating Coaches

Priority 1 2 3 4 5

Sport	Date observations and evaluations are started. Month/Day/Year			Date observations and evaluations are due. Month/Day/Year		
Football						
Basketball						
Baseball						
Comments						

9. Scheduling the use of practice facilities

Priority 1 2 3 4 5

Sport	Date practice facility schedule is created. Month/Day/Year			Date practice facility schedule is needed. Month/Day/Year		
Football						
Basketball						
Baseball						
Comments						

10. Schedule physicals for athletes

Priority 1 2 3 4 5

Sport	Date the students and parents are notified concerning physicals. Month/Day/Year			Date the physicals are given. Month/Day/Year		
Football						
Basketball						
Baseball						
Comments						

Additional Comments and Suggestions:

APPENDIX G

GUIDE TO ATHLETIC DEPARTMENT TASK MANAGEMENT

Guide to Athletic Department Task Management

Where appropriate, the Due Dates used in this *Guide* are based on the Georgia High School Association's 2007 – 2008 Calendar. The number of days required to start and complete each task were obtained from the athletic directors' responses on the *Athletic Department Task Management Survey*.

1. Creating a Budget: The average start date for preparing a budget was 58 days before the due date.

Start Budget Process: January 17, 2008

Budget Due: March 15, 2008

2. Ordering Equipment: The average date for placing an equipment order was 93 days before the first day of practice.

Sport	Order Equipment On:	Equipment Due Date:
Football	April 30, 2007	August 1, 2007
Basketball	July 28, 2007	October 29, 2007
Baseball	November 3, 2007	February 4, 2008

3. Scheduling Athletic Contests: The average start date for preparing a schedule was 93 days before the due date.

Sport	Start Scheduling Process On:	Schedule Due Date:
Football	December 13, 2007	March 15, 2008
Basketball	January 13, 2008	April 15, 2008
Baseball	February 12, 2008	May 15, 2008

4. Obtaining Game Contracts: The average start date for obtaining game contracts was 77 days before the due date.

Sport	Start Obtaining Contracts On:	Contracts Due Date:
Football	December 29, 2007	March 15, 2008
Basketball	January 29, 2008	April 15, 2008
Baseball	February 28, 2008	May 15, 2008

5. Scheduling Referees: The average start date for scheduling referees was 54 days before the first game.

Sport	Send Game Schedules On:	First Contest to be Played On:
Football	July 8, 2007	August 31, 2007
Basketball	September 24, 2007	November 17, 2007
Baseball	January 2, 2008	February 25, 2008

6. Scheduling Contest Transportation: The average start date for scheduling transportation is 26 days before the first game.

Sport	Send Game Schedules On:	Transportation Request Due Date:
Football	August 5, 2007	August 31, 2007
Basketball	October 22, 2007	November 17, 2007
Baseball	January 30, 2008	February 25, 2008

7. Eligibility Lists: The average start date for creating an eligibility list is 52 days before the due date.

Sport	Create Eligibility List On:	Eligibility List Due On:
Football	June 20, 2007	August 11, 2007
Basketball	September 6, 2007	October 28, 2007

Baseball	December 15, 2007	February 5, 2008
----------	-------------------	------------------

8. Observing and Evaluating Coaches: The average start date for observing and evaluating coaches was 128 days before the evaluations and observations were due.

Sport	Begin O & E On:	End O & E On:
Football	August 1, 2007	December 15, 2007
Basketball	October 29, 2007	March 8, 2008
Baseball	February 4, 2008	May 31, 2008

9. Scheduling the use of Practice Facilities: The average start date for creating a practice facility schedule was 42 days before the first practice.

Sport	Create Schedule On:	Facility Use Schedule Due Date:
Football	June 20, 2007	August 1, 2007
Basketball	September 17, 2007	October 29, 2007
Baseball	December 24, 2007	February 4, 2008

10. Schedule Physicals for Athletes: The average start date for notifying the students and parents concerning physicals was 50 days before the physicals were given.

Sport	Send Physical Notice On:	Physicals Due Date:
Football	March 26, 2008	May 15, 2008
Basketball	March 26, 2008	May 15, 2008
Baseball	March 26, 2008	May 15, 2008

APPENDIX H
FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS FOR PRINCIPALS

Dear xxx,

Thank you so much for participating in my *Athletic Department Task Management Survey* back in September. I have finally crunched the numbers - analyzed the data (to be more educationally sounding) - and created the *Guide to Athletic Department Task Management*. The *Guide* lists the ten athletic department tasks addressed in the survey, and it provides a Start Date for each task. The *Guide* is attached to this message. Because the guide is electronic (an Excel[®] document), it can be adjusted for use in future years. Also, it is possible to add other tasks, start dates, and due dates to the document. You are only limited by your imagination. Well, that and your ability to use a spreadsheet, or your ability to convince one of your students to edit the spreadsheet!

It has been recommended by my committee that I ask the follow-up questions listed below. After I analyze the responses I receive, I'll be able to finish my dissertation. If you would be so kind as to put your comments below each question and to return this message to me, I would be most grateful.

- How did your career path, as it relates to coaching, impact the responses you gave concerning the starting and ending dates of the tasks listed in the survey?
 -

- What additional athletic department tasks do you feel need to be added to the tasks listed in the survey? The tasks on the survey were create a budget, order equipment, schedule contests, obtain game contracts, schedule referees, schedule contest transportation, create eligibility lists, observe and evaluate coaches, create a practice facilities schedule, and notify parents and students concerning physicals.
 -

- On a scale of 1 to 5, what rank would you give these additional tasks?
 -

- Why would you give these tasks this particular ranking?
 -

- There were only two questions on the survey with a significant difference between the principals' responses and the athletic directors' responses: the priority of scheduling referees and the priority of filing eligibility lists. Athletic directors gave both of these tasks a higher priority than principals gave them. Why do you think this significant difference exists?

-

Again, thank you for participating in the original survey and for answering these follow-up questions.

Yours,

Art Denney

APPENDIX I

FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS FOR ATHLETIC DIRECTORS

Dear xxx,

Thank you so much for participating in my *Athletic Department Task Management Survey* back in September. I have finally crunched the numbers - analyzed the data (to be more educationally sounding) - and created the *Guide To Athletic Department Task Management*. The *Guide* lists the ten athletic department tasks addressed in the survey, and it provides a Start Date for each task. The *Guide* is attached to this message. Because the guide is electronic (an Excel[®] document), it can be adjusted for use in future years. Also, it is possible to add other tasks, start dates, and due dates to the document. You are only limited by your imagination. Well, that and your ability to use a spreadsheet, or your ability to convince one of your students to edit the spreadsheet!

It has been recommended by my committee that I ask the follow-up questions listed below. After I analyze the responses I receive, I'll be able to finish my dissertation. If you would be so kind as to put your comments below each question and to return this message to me, I would be most grateful.

- What additional athletic department tasks do you feel need to be added to the tasks listed in the survey? The tasks on the survey were create a budget, order equipment, schedule contests, obtain game contracts, schedule referees, schedule contest transportation, create eligibility lists, observe and evaluate coaches, create a practice facilities schedule, and notify parents and students concerning physicals.
 -
- On a scale of 1 to 5, what rank would you give these additional tasks?
 -
- Why would you give these tasks this particular ranking?
 -

- There were only two questions on the survey with a significant difference between the principals' responses and the athletic directors' responses: the priority of scheduling referees and the priority of filing eligibility lists. Athletic directors gave both of these tasks a higher priority than principals gave them. Why do you think this significant difference exists?
 -

Again, thank you for participating in the original survey and for answering these follow-up questions.

Yours,

Art Denney