

## Growth of Middle Level Schools by Grade Level (1965-2000)

<b>Year Data Collected:</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>1991</b>	<b>1980</b>	<b>1971</b>	<b>1965</b>
<b># of Middle Level Schools</b>	<b>14,107</b>	<b>12,095</b>	<b>12,226</b>	<b>10,445</b>	<b>6,800</b>
Grades 5-6-7-8	10	11	4	7	-
Grades 6-7-8	59	40	15	16	5
Grades 7-8	17	24	31	24	20
Grades 7-8-9	5	19	42	45	67
Other (5-6, 6, etc.)	9	6	8	8	8 (includes 5-6-7-8)

Middle Level: Schools serving early adolescents in grade organizational patterns from grades 5 through 9.

Source: Middle Level Leadership Center compiled from Government Records, Publications, and Market Data Retrieval Data Bank. See [MLLC.org](http://MLLC.org) and select "Research" from the MLLC home page.

## Schools Changing Grade Organizational Configurations to 5-6-7-8 and 6-7-8 Grade Patterns

	<b>2000</b>	<b>1992</b>	<b>1980</b>	<b>1965</b>
<b>Schools that adopted 5-6-7-8 and 6-7-8 patterns at some time.</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>&lt;10</b>
<b>% of those Schools that adopted those Patterns in Prior Decade</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>61 in 6-7-8  65 in 5-6-7-8</b>	<b>-</b>

Sources: NASSP National Studies of Middle Level Principalship published in 2002 (Valentine, et.al.), 1993 (Valentine, et. al.), 1981 (Valentine, et.al.), and 1966 (Rock and Hemphill).

## Reasons Why Schools Changed to 5-6-7-8 or 6-7-8 Grade Patterns

	<b>2000</b>	<b>1992</b>	<b>1980</b>
Provide program suited to needs of early adolescents	89	86	61
Provide better transition from elementary to high school	84	82	57
Employ a new curriculum or instructional innovation	64	60	31
Solve concerns about the Junior High	58	47	24
Adjust to enrollment trends	49	33	46
Employ programs successfully implemented in other schools	48	48	17
Utilize a new facility	32	20	28
Provide fifth and sixth graders with a more specialized curriculum	31	31	26
Move ninth grade to the high school	23	29	19

Sources: NASSP National Studies of Middle Level Principalship published in 2002 (Valentine, et.al.), 1993 (Valentine, et. al.), and 1981 (Valentine, et.al.).

## Principals' Opinions About Ideal Grade Patterns

	<b>2000</b>	<b>1992</b>	<b>1980</b>
Grades 5-6-7-8	9	7	16
Grades 6-7-8	65	72	64
Grades 7-8	16	12	18
Grades 7-8-9	3	6	17
Other (5-6, 6, etc.)	7	3	5

Sources: NASSP National Studies of Middle Level Principalship published in 2002 (Valentine, et.al.), 1993 (Valentine, et. al.), and 1981 (Valentine, et.al.).

The majority of all principals, regardless of the grade level of schools they administer, believe the 6-7-8 grade pattern is ideal.

Support for 5-6-7-8 appears on the decline, as does support for 7-8-9.

## Student Enrollment Trends in Middle Level Schools

	<b>2000</b>	<b>1992</b>	<b>1980</b>	<b>1965</b>
Fewer than 400 students	27	22	20	77
400 to 599 students	24	27	25	
600 to 799 students	22	23	24	
800 to 999 students	14	12	18	
1,000 to 1,399 students	11	13	10	23
1400 or more students	2	3	3	

Sources: NASSP National Studies of Middle Level Principalship published in 2002 (Valentine, et.al.), 1993 (Valentine, et. al.), 1981 (Valentine, et.al.) and Rock and Hemphill (1966).

## Trends in Average Daily Attendance of Middle Level Schools

	<b>2000</b>	<b>1992</b>	<b>1980</b>
96% or Higher	42	42	19
90-95%	52	48	60
80-89%	5	9	18
Less than 80%	1	1	3

Sources: NASSP National Studies of Middle Level Principalship published in 2002 (Valentine, et.al.), 1993 (Valentine, et. al.), and 1981 (Valentine, et.al.).

Schools of 5-6-7-8 and 6-7-8 had higher ADA.

Schools of 7-8 and 7-8-9 had lower ADA.

Schools of 1000+ enrollments had lower ADA.

Schools of higher free/reduced lunch percentages had lower ADA.

## Per Pupil Expenditures in Year 2000 Constant Dollars

	<b>2000</b>	<b>1992</b>	<b>1980</b>	<b>1965</b>
Less than \$4000 per Students	24	52	85	97
More than \$4000 per student	76	48	15	3

Sources: NASSP National Studies of Middle Level Principalship published in 2002 (Valentine, et.al.), 1993 (Valentine, et. al.), and 1981 (Valentine, et.al.).

Even with adjustment for inflation, districts are spending significantly more each decade. Mandated programs and services and an expanded overall role of education have increased substantially in recent decades and are logical factors associated with these increased costs.

## Classroom Teacher to Student Ratios in Middle Level Schools

	<b>2000</b>	<b>1992</b>	<b>1980</b>
1:10 or less	1	1	0
1:11 to 1:15	7	4	5
1:16 to 1:20	20	14	14
1:21 to 1:25	40	42	45
1:26 to 1:30	28	33	31
1:31 to 1:35	4	6	5
1:36 or higher	<1	0	0

Sources: NASSP National Studies of Middle Level Principalship published in 2002 (Valentine, et.al.), 1993 (Valentine, et. al.), and 1981 (Valentine, et.al.).

Promising trend toward smaller class sizes.

Fiscal shortfalls since 2001 may be reversing this trend; data not yet available.

Schools of 5-6-7-8 have smallest class sizes

Schools of 7-8-9 have largest class sizes



## Gender of Principals of Middle Level Schools

	<b>2000</b>	<b>1992</b>	<b>1980</b>	<b>1965</b>
Male	73	80	94	96
Female	27	20	6	4

Sources: NASSP National Studies of Middle Level Principalship published in 2002 (Valentine, et.al.), 1993 (Valentine, et. al.), 1981 (Valentine, et.al.), and 1966 (Rock and Hemphill).

Percent of female principals at the middle level has increased significantly in recent decades.

Increases for female principals has been consistent for all grade patterns except “other.”

Highest percent of female principals today are in 7-8-9 schools and in metropolitan areas.

## Ethnicity of Middle Level Principals

	<b>2000</b>	<b>1992</b>	<b>1980</b>
Caucasian	92	90	92
African American	5	6	6
Chicano/Hispanic	2	2	1
American Indian	<1	<1	<1
Asian American	<1	1	<1

Sources: NASSP National Studies of Middle Level Principalship published in 2002 (Valentine, et.al.), 1993 (Valentine, et. al.), and 1981 (Valentine, et.al.).

Ethnicity of middle level principals has varied very little over past three decades.

ML education has made no progress in bringing ethnic diversity to the principalship.

## Highest Earned Degree of Middle Level Principals

	<b>2000</b>	<b>1992</b>	<b>1980</b>	<b>1965</b>
BA or less	<1	<1	1	6
Master's	19	15	24	35
Post-Masters	77	74	73	54
Doctorate	11	11	8	4

Sources: NASSP National Studies of Middle Level Principalship published in 2002 (Valentine, et.al.), 1993 (Valentine, et. al.), 1981 (Valentine, et.al.), and 1966 (Rock and Hemphill).

The formal educational preparation of middle level principals increased each decade.

Female middle level principals have consistently had more formal education than their male counterparts.

## Age of Principals of Middle Level Schools

	<b>2000</b>	<b>1992</b>	<b>1980</b>	<b>1965</b>
<30	1	1	1	2
30-39	12	11	23	27
40-49	37	45	39	33
50-59	48	31	32	30
60+	2	3	5	8

Sources: NASSP National Studies of Middle Level Principals published in 2002 (Valentine, et.al.), 1993 (Valentine, et. al.), 1981 (Valentine, et.al.), and 1966 (Rock and Hemphill).

Principals in 2000 significantly older than counterparts in prior decades.

Half of principals were fifty years or older in 2000.

Throughout the decade studies, female principals have been older than their male counterparts.

## Age At Appointment to First Principalship

	<b>2000</b>	<b>1992</b>	<b>1980</b>
<30	7	16	19
30-39	42	48	53
40-49	41	32	24
50+	10	4	4

Sources: NASSP National Studies of Middle Level Principalship published in 2002 (Valentine, et.al.), 1993 (Valentine, et. al.), and 1981 (Valentine, et.al.).

Middle level principals have been appointed to their first principalship at a significantly older age each decade.

## Years Middle Level Principals have been Principals

	<b>2000</b>	<b>1992</b>	<b>1980</b>	<b>1965</b>
1 Year	10	6	7	6
2-3 Years	20	16	12	14
4-9 Years	36	33	34	36
10-19 Years	25	31	35	39
20 or More Years	9	14	12	15

Sources: NASSP National Studies of Middle Level Principals published in 2002 (Valentine, et.al.), 1993 (Valentine, et. al.), 1981 (Valentine, et.al.), and 1966 (Rock and Hemphill).

Middle level principals of the last decade are less experienced as principals than principals of prior decades.

\*Principals of today are also older than in prior years, so today's principals have less principalship experience and they are older than their prior counterparts.

## Total Work Hours in Typical Workweek for Middle Level Principals

	<b>2000</b>	<b>1992</b>	<b>1980</b>	<b>1965</b>
Less than 40 hours	1	0	4	5
40-49 hours	5	12	27	36
50-59 hours	46	52	55	47
60-69 hours	39	30	15	10
70 or more hours	9	6	2	2

Sources: NASSP National Studies of Middle Level Principalship published in 2002 (Valentine, et.al.), 1993 (Valentine, et. al.), 1981 (Valentine, et.al.), and 1966 (Rock and Hemphill).

Each decade, the ML principals' workweek has become significantly longer.

Principals working less than 40 hours per week were typically principals of parochial middle level schools.

For two decades principals have consistently indicated that they **SHOULD SPEND** the most time on Program Development yet they spend more time on School Management, Personnel issues, Student Activities, and Student Behavior than they spend on Program Development.

## Middle Level Principals' Career Plans Next 5 Years

	<b>2000</b>	<b>1992</b>	<b>1980</b>	<b>1965</b>
Remain in Current Position	38	50	37	51
Retire	26	14	-	-
Seek Different Principalship	11	6	9	9
Seek Central Office Position	25	21	26	16
Seek Other Educational Position	1	1	4	8
Other	0	8	4	16

Sources: NASSP National Studies of Middle Level Principalship published in 2002 (Valentine, et.al.), 1993 (Valentine, et. al.), 1981 (Valentine, et.al.), and 1966 (Rock and Hemphill).

Middle level principals are retiring from the principalship in increasing numbers in recent decades.

More principals are planning to leave the principalship at this time than since the eighties.



## Certification of Majority of Teachers in Middle Level Schools

	<b>2000</b>	<b>1992</b>	<b>1980</b>
Elementary Certification	30	26	9
Middle Level Certification	18	11	11
Secondary Certification	52	63	80

Sources: NASSP National Studies of Middle Level Principalship published in 2002 (Valentine, et.al.), 1993 (Valentine, et. al.), and 1981 (Valentine, et.al.).

Most teachers in most middle level schools have secondary certification, but the percentages are decreasing significantly each decade.

Middle Level Certification has increased, especially in recent decade.

Elementary Certification has increased steadily throughout the decades.

## School Faculties with One-Half or More Female Teachers

	<b>2000</b>	<b>1992</b>	<b>1980</b>
All Schools	89	86	62
5-6-7-8 Schools	86	83	80
6-7-8 Schools	89	89	84
7-8 Schools	95	91	58
7-8-9 Schools	95	82	58

Sources: NASSP National Studies of Middle Level Principalship published in 2002 (Valentine, et.al.), 1993 (Valentine, et. al.), and 1981 (Valentine, et.al.).

Increasing numbers of female teachers in middle level schools over the decades.

Schools of 7-8 and 7-8-9 have higher percentages of majority of staff being female teachers than 5-6-7-8 and 6-7-8.

## Grouping of Middle Level Students by Academic Ability

	<b>2000</b>	<b>1992</b>	<b>1980</b>
Students grouped into specific classes by academic ability (e.g. reading, math)	72	69	88
Students not grouped into specific classes by academic ability but teachers group students within classes	13	13	
No form of ability grouping by academic ability.	15	18	12

Sources: NASSP National Studies of Middle Level Principalship published in 2002 (Valentine, et.al.), 1993 (Valentine, et. al.), and 1981 (Valentine, et.al.).

Very little, if any, progress on reducing ability grouping by academic ability. Made some progress in eighties and then lost it in the nineties.

5-6-7-8 and 6-7-8 schools much less likely to group by academic ability.

Nearly all schools plan to continue their same pattern of ability grouping.

## Most Common Formats of Gifted and Talented Programs in Middle Level Schools

	<b>2000</b>	<b>1992</b>	<b>1980</b>
No gifted and talented program	16	16	30
Release time for special classes	45	35	38
Heterogeneous classes with individualized assignments	35		
Clusters of gifted/talented students in heterogeneous classes with individualized assignments	26	51	51
After school, evening, or weekend programs	22	16	13
Summer programs	6	9	9

Sources: NASSP National Studies of Middle Level Principalship published in 2002 (Valentine, et.al.), 1993 (Valentine, et. al.), and 1981 (Valentine, et.al.).

All forms of gifted and talented programs except summer programs have become increasingly popular in recent decades. Schools can have multiple programs so respondents marked all that applied.