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Introduction

Over the past decade, how school leaders are prepared has become an area of increased interest at the state and national level as policy makers, funders, and researchers focus on enhancing leadership capacity in schools. Many thoughtful commentators speak to the need to train and develop educational leaders capable of guiding school improvement efforts in an age of heightened performance accountability demands and increased job complexity. Accordingly, the efficacy of leadership preparation, primarily at the level of the building administrator, has emerged as topic of public deliberation, linked to the growing consensus that effective school-level leadership is central to educational improvement and reform (Educational Research Service, 2000; Farkas, Johnson, & Foley, 2003; Hallinger & Heck, 1998; Leithwood, Seashore-Lewis, Anderson, & Wahlstrom, 2004). As evidence emerges that strongly suggests that effective leadership practices are central to facilitating and sustaining school reform, the recruitment, preparation, retention, evaluation, and ongoing development of school leaders is seen as an crucial pathway to build the capacity to successfully improve schools (Davis, Darling-Hammond, LaPointe, & Meyerson, 2005; Leithwood, Seashore-Lewis, Anderson, & Wahlstrom, 2005; Orr & Pounder, 2006).

Concerns expressed about preparation programs’ role in developing leadership capacity are linked indirectly to the abilities and training of those who prepare future principals in University-based programs (Levine, 2005; McCarthy & Kuh, 1997). Concerns have been raised about the lack of study on the impact of the rise of leadership preparation training in non-Carnegie Research 1 institutions and parallel decline in relative production of educational Masters and Doctoral Degree by top-tier Research institutions (Baker, Orr, & Young, 2005). With the rise in new players on the educational preparation landscape and the rise in student enrollment in University-based educational leadership preparation programs, there has been a significant rise in the use of part-time and adjunct faculty, who some characterize as lacking expertise in the areas they teach (Levine, 2005). Murphy and Vriesenga (2004) additionally argue that many faculty do not produce rigorous research that is relevant to the field or to practicing administrators. Yet, efforts to build pipeline capacity to produce highly qualified educational leadership faculty and to develop a research agenda for the field of educational leadership continue (McCarthy, 1999; Murphy 2006; Ogawa, Goldring, & Conley, 2000).
Faculty preparation, support, composition, and efficacy remain central concerns for the field of educational leadership, as the enterprise of educational leadership preparation is dependent upon the people who stand beside the whiteboards of our leadership preparation classes. It is these individuals and their endeavors of inquiry, teaching and program development that deeply matter to the field of leadership preparation. Faculty experiences, preparation, and capacity are foundational to work in developing successful and innovative programs (Darling-Hammond, LaPointe, Meyerson, & Orr, 2007; Jackson & Kelly, 2002). Yet, relatively little is known of this particular group of individuals, at least recently, who wield so much power and authority over the minds of America’s educational leaders. This paper seeks to extend the work on educational leadership faculty by providing a detailed analysis and profile of one state’s building level administrator faculty (Baker, Wolf-Wendel, & Twombly, 2007; Levine, 2005; McCarthy & Kuh, 1997; Pounder, Crow, & Bergeson, 2004).

Studies of the educational leadership professoriate have been conducted in the past in somewhat regular intervals. A recent and detailed study was conducted in 1994 by McCarthy and Kuh (1997). It found, among other things, a significant closure of the gender gap in educational leadership faculty, but no significant progress in closing the racial gap. This study was a follow up study of one conducted in the late 1980’s which, among other things, found a decrease in the number of full-time faculty supported by programs (McCarthy, Kuh, Newell & Iacona, 1988). While witnessing the rise of female faculty members, the McCarthy & Kuh study found that in 1997 80% of educational administration faculty were male (up from less than 5% a generation ago) and 90% were white. In contrast, Pounder, Crow, & Bergeson (2004) gathered a much smaller sample, but found that recent hires in Educational Administration programs to be female and have earned a Ph.D. Using data from the survey of earned doctorates, Baker, Wolf-Wendel, and Twombly (2007) studied the 1990-2000 faculty preparation pipeline in Educational Administration. They found that 19% of doctoral degree-earning individuals pursue faculty careers and the share of females increased during that timeframe. Surprisingly, they found that nearly identical numbers of faculty were emerging from research and non-research Universities in 2000. They argue that two distinct pipelines existed. The first could be characterized as an academic elite pipeline, preparing individuals for the professoriat. They state: “these individuals attend highly selective undergraduate institutions, receive their doctorates from top-ranked research universities, attend graduate school full-time, hold fellowships or assistantships while in graduate school, and are most likely to academic careers in postsecondary institutions” (p. 214). Yet they noted this was not the dominant pipeline, which “consists of individuals who are older and who worked full time in graduate school within the public schools or as full-time faculty members before graduating from universities” (p. 215). Finally, other studies into the educational leadership professoriate include Hills’ 1965 survey of NCPEA members and Campbell and Newell’s (1973) sampling study of educational leaders in the United States and
Canada. These prior studies form a foundation of inquiry into the educational administration professoriate, albeit in limited numbers.

**Context and Methods for the Indiana study**

While these studies have provided invaluable insights into the educational leadership professoriate, none focused specifically on obtaining full faculty population data for an individual state. Within that context we recently published a study which “mapped” principal preparation program characteristics and graduate outcomes across 17 state approved programs in Indiana (Black, Bathon & Poindexter, 2007). We developed and disseminated a program narrative research instrument designed to gather information on all building-level licensure and Masters plus licensure preparation programs. Through multiple collaborative efforts, all 17 accredited building-level administrator programs returned narrative instruments and supporting documentation (over 1500 pages). The topical areas covered in the program narrative instrument are: Rationale, Leadership Standards, Program Structural Elements, Candidate Admission, Candidate Assessment, Program Curriculum and Curriculum Sequence, Teaching Methods and Pedagogical Approaches, Program Evaluation and Continuing Assessment, Program Field Experiences, Program Recruitment Strategies, Program Faculty, Program Strengths and Limitations, and Distinctive Program Elements. This paper draws from responses reported by programs about their faculty composition. In regards to faculty, program chairs were asked questions about the total number of full-time tenure and non-tenure line faculty as well as split-time and part-time faculty. In addition, we requested data on faculty gender, race, previous administrative experience, teaching loads, terminal degree, graduate versus undergraduate responsibilities, internship responsibilities, publications, grants, professional organization membership, and areas of strength or speciality (See Appendix B in full report-Black, Bathon, & Poindexter, 2007).

In addition to the program narrative responses, the authors attempted to triangulate evidentiary data from program document submissions, program approval and accreditation documents, accompanying faculty curriculum vita and information available on program websites. The data were analyzed both by the primary researchers and by a consortium of program representatives to the state. In total in this paper we present a profile and analysis of the full sample (n=164) of faculty members involved in the preparation of school leaders in Indiana during the 2005-2006 academic year.\(^1\) The faculty composition

\(^1\) As self-reported data, we expect that there may have been undercounts in some areas as some programs took greater care to count all faculty teaching in the program. With the notable exception of one rapidly expanding program, the reported figures appear consistent with information gathered through programs websites and NCATE /UAS reviews.
data were an integral part of the overall study of building-level leadership preparation programs across all 17 approved programs in the state of Indiana.

**Results**

In regard to faculty, the study sought information in several areas related to leadership preparation program faculty. First, we asked the programs to report the faculty positions and time classifications. We divided the time commitment and position of program faculty into four possible categories: full time tenure-track, full time non-tenure track, part time including adjuncts, and split-time with responsibilities in multiple programs. We also asked about faculty administrative experience, faculty degree attainment, faculty responsibilities, and faculty demographics. The results of each of these inquiries are presented below.

**Faculty Titles, Positions, and Roles**

Based on responses from all 17 accredited programs, there are 164 faculty members teaching in building-level administrative programs in Indiana. Of these 164, roughly half (79 people or 48 percent) are adjunct faculty, with half (80 people or 49 percent) of the total faculty listed as part-time faculty. If split-time faculty (less than full-time line to building-level leadership program) are added to this total, nearly two-thirds (65 percent) of the faculty devoted to preparing building-level leaders in Indiana are not full-time faculty. A graphical representation of this distribution can be seen in the figure below.

---

2 Faculty is classified as “full-time” if the faculty member is both employed full-time in an educational administration/leadership faculty position or principal preparation program and devotes a majority of their time to principal preparation teaching, service, and/or research. Within the full-time distinction, faculty is classified as either tenure-track or non-tenure-track and finally classified as closely as possible into the available categories. Within the less than full-time distinction, faculty is classified as part-time and split-time faculty. Split-time faculty are faculty that are employed full-time by the university, but spend less than all of their time in the educational administration/leadership program or principal preparation program. We found that split-time faculty are often located within Curriculum and Instruction departments. Adjunct faculties are typically contracted on a course-by-course basis. Based on our data, observations and conversations with colleagues in other departments, adjunct faculty often are currently practicing administrators, although the programs were not asked to supply this information. Within the part-time category, faculty should be classified as closely as possible within the given classifications. If, at any time, the classification “other” was used in the narrative, programs were asked to further describe that particular faculty classification.
Within each of these categories there are further distinctions. First, as to full-time tenure track faculty, the highest percentage is associate professor level faculty. The second most frequent full-time classification is full professor. Finally, assistant professor level faculty members are the least common tenure-track, full-time faculty in Indiana. The sub-distribution of faculty categories mentioned above can also be seen in the following figure:
Although the large number of faculty contained in the Adjunct classification above may appear high, because our report is primarily based on self-reporting of data it is possible this number is even higher. The split-time faculty are primarily drawn from other units within the Colleges of Education, most notably Curriculum and Instruction Departments. One program is an exception in that its’ faculty primarily reside in other colleges, such as Business, and teach in the leadership preparation program in the summer. The use of part-time adjunct faculty indicates a connection to the “field” of practicing or just retired school administrators, and a recent study of innovative programs indicated that experienced adjunct faculty positively impacted student learning outcomes (LaPointe & Davis, 2006). Yet, the high percentage of adjunct faculty may raise questions as to program coherence, research-based teaching, and program capacity for quality assessment, reflection, and improvement. That only 20 percent of the faculty teaching in the programs are tenure line faculty may be another area for concern, as those faculty have certain institutional responsibilities and commitments that part-time and clinical faculty do not have. Furthermore, for the 17 programs accredited in the state of Indiana, only 21 faculty members are employed at the assistant and associate professorship level. These faculty are more likely to be involved in longer term program development and design work and have access to institutional resources and knowledge of broader university institutional procedures that part-time and adjunct faculty typically do not have. Their relative scarcity is notable.

Administrative Experience
Indiana building-level administrative preparation faculty members have significant experience in school leadership positions. Programs were asked to provide information on the school administrative experience of the full-time, non-adjunct faculty. The reported levels of administrative experience attained by current faculty shows some variation not just in the amount of experience, but also in the highest positions in which the faculty served. The breakdown of administrative experience of non-adjunct faculty members in Indiana can be seen on the following page.

---

3 For instance, Program 17 reported the use of 14 adjunct faculty in response to our inquiry. In reviewing the same program’s NCATE report, the program reported 95 faculty that are currently practicing administrators at the advanced level (NCATE classification for all non-initial licensures in education) and the same program’s initial program request to the Indiana Division of Professional Standards Teacher Education Committee showed double the number of faculty listed to teach various courses in the program.
As the chart shows, the most common K-12 levels of school based administrative experience attained by tenure track faculty are in the positions of central office staff or assistant superintendent. However, 8 of the tenure track faculty do not have any administrative experience. Some of the reported positions for this non-administrative experience group include other experiences such as school attorney and school board member. The non-tenure track full-time faculty members have experience mostly at the ranks of the principalship and the superintendency. As such, the non-tenure track (visiting and clinical) faculty all bring some level of school administrative experience to their programs.

*Highest Degree Completed*

Programs were asked to provide information for all faculty, including adjunct faculty, on the highest degree completed, including the distribution of Ph.D.s, Ed.D., and Master’s level faculty. However, the highest degree information was not reported for all faculty by the programs so the numbers reported represent a majority of faculty, but not a full sample.
As the figures demonstrate, the highest percentage of program faculty has obtained a Ph.D. A similar, but slightly lower number, obtained an Ed.D. In sum, 84 percent of the building-level administrator faculty in Indiana holds a doctoral level degree. Sixteen percent of faculty in Indiana holds something less than a doctorate as their highest attained degree. If only full-time faculty is considered, then the percentage completing a doctoral level degree jumps to 96 percent. Although the majority of building-level preparation program faculty have a doctoral degree, a significant percentage, 25 percent, of part-time and split-time faculty do not have a doctoral level degree, which extrapolated to the full amount of faculty teaching in the programs, means a little less than 20 percent of faculty do not have terminal degrees. This is further skewed by the size of one larger program that relies heavily on adjunct faculty.
Faculty Responsibilities

As to faculty teaching responsibilities, programs in the state utilize different mechanisms to track the percentage of time faculty are expected to devote towards their teaching responsibilities. This is especially true when reporting on faculty responsibility for oversight of field experiences. Therefore, it is difficult to compile and report given the data on faculty responsibilities provided in the responses. However, a few patterns were clearly noticeable. Full-time tenure track faculty members are expected to teach one to three classes per semester. Full-time non-tenure track faculty members, such as visiting and clinical faculty, are expected to teach more, typically from two to four classes per semester. Adjunct faculty members typically teach only one course per semester and do not necessarily teach every semester. If a full-time faculty member was assigned to program coordination duties and oversight of adjunct faculty, their teaching load is reduced. Finally, field experience oversight was conducted both by full-time and adjunct faculty.

As to research responsibilities, only long standing and large programs reported activity in terms of scholarly work. This represented one of the greatest areas of difference between the programs. In terms of faculty publications, although specific information was requested, many programs responded only generally. The range of responses varied from one program that listed faculty publications in 21 different peer reviewed, academic journals, to other programs that, in the past two years, listed a handful of non-peer reviewed publications in “practitioner” journals. Others reported no publication output by the program. The large state universities far exceeded the small private universities and mid-size to small public universities in terms of publication activity. In particular, two programs’ publication production exceeded the combined total of the rest of the state, indicating a distinct departmental emphasis and orientation to national audiences. Program 9 described their publication output in this way: “Faculty who work with our program are part-time adjuncts, and often are on the ‘front lines’ of leadership positions with area school corporations. As such, none have been published in academic, peer-reviewed journals during the last two years.”

Grant activity falls along similar lines, although some small private universities have recently obtained large grants. The monetary value of the grants range from a million dollars to a couple thousand dollars over a two year period. The majority of programs received grants ranging from $20,000 to $200,000.

Faculty Diversity

Faculty in Indiana are predominately White and male, with a fair representation of White female faculty. Less than 7% of program faculty was identified as members of racial minority groups. Of the total minority faculty reported for the state of Indiana, nine are African American, two are Latino and four
are Native American. The full demographic distribution of faculty in Indiana is presented in the chart below.

Furthermore, the distribution of female faculty is not even across the different types of faculty positions. For instance, the disparity in male and female representation is highest among non-tenure, mostly clinical faculty. The disparity is lowest among tenure-track faculty where the percentage of women faculty is 35%. The graphical representation of this phenomenon is presented below.

![Number of Men and Women in Faculty Positions](image)

**Discussion**

In reviewing the building-level leadership faculty data from Indiana, several noteworthy patterns are evident.
Faculty experience. The building-level leadership faculty in Indiana does have a wealth of administrative experience. Not only does a wide majority of the full-time faculty have some administrative experience, but the clinical and adjunct faculty also typically bring significant experience as k-12 administrators to bear in their teaching. Several studies show that students appreciate and incorporate the knowledge that carefully selected, k-12 administrative experience brings (See for example, Orr & Orphanos, 2007)

The vast majority of the people teaching our future building-level leaders in Indiana have been educational leaders themselves. While McCarthy (1999) noted more recent shifts in the field away from the scholar toward advancing notions of a scholar-practitioner who are former practitioners who can bring valued “real world” experience. While we noted this trend in Indiana, a review of curriculum vitae, revealed that in particular fields such as law, politics, and finance, classes are being taught by former practitioners who have little training in the discipline-based subfield and who are not conducting research in the area. This is an issue that McCarthy recognized as a potentially enduring issue and Levine (2005) and Murphy and Viersanga (2004) critiqued as an indicator of poor program quality and a general problem in the field. As a result of the study, the Indiana University College of Education Dean has utilized this data to organize efforts to utilize distance technology and inter-system cooperation to utilize discipline trained researchers located at the research 1 campus in delivery of instruction at the regional campuses.

Research socialization and productivity. Meriting further investigation is whether many of these faculty with significant amounts of experience may come from the dominant second pipeline that Baker et. Al (2007) describe as recently producing half of the pipeline of faculty. Baker and his colleagues suggest that individuals in this pipeline are not sufficiently socialized to conduct rigorous inquiry and meet the scholarly expectations of the professoriate. They distinguished this pipeline as characterized by significantly more mature individuals earning their degrees while working full time in k-12 public school settings. Additionally, a significant number are prepared in non-research intensive institutions. The strength represented by additional experience in this track and connections to local school systems often represents fewer research socialization experiences in graduate school, including assistantships, attendance and presentation at conferences, significant research-tied mentorships, and the building of national level relationships. Tschannen-Morran, Firestone, Hoy, and Johnson suggest in their 2000 study of productive scholars in educational administration (as opposed to typical scholars) were not demographically different, but rather were distinguished by other characteristics and experiences. They were trained in research 1 institutions, built national-level professional and relational networks, were more likely to teach fewer classes and to view research and teaching as interdependent, and were significantly more likely than the control group to view research as the most important professional
obligation. They argue that future administrators and scholars would benefit from different training (Tschannen-Morran, et. Al., 2000).

In Indiana, faculty teaching building-level leaders in Indiana have a high level of doctoral degree attainment. Although not the purpose of this study, we might hypothesize that consistent with the literature on doctoral program preparation and pipelines, that even though current faculty have had exposure to higher-level educational theory and research, quality difference exist in the quality and depth of the doctoral study process, particularly when students attain doctoral degrees while working full-time in K-12 setting. Whereas we did not initially ask for program faculties doctoral experience, initial review of faculty curriculum vitae suggest most of the minority of tenure-track faculty members had different preparation experiences than the majority of the professors currently teaching in building-level administrative preparation programs in Indiana.

While the k-12 experience and terminal degree educational qualifications of the building-level leadership faculty in Indiana can be cast as a positive aspect spanning all programs to varying degrees, the same cannot be said for the scholarly productivity of Indiana’s building-level leadership faculty. The majority of scholarly output is centered in only a three programs, which do not include the two largest producers of principals. What we encountered in Indiana is consistent with the findings of Baker, Young, and Orr (2005), who found that between 1990 and 2003 comprehensive universities produced substantially greater shares of educational administration doctorates and masters degrees, while research intensive universities production tapered off. In Indiana, from 2001 to the present, there has been a rise in approved preparation programs from 10 programs to 17. Concurrently, the number of building-level administrative licenses granted in Indiana rose from 368 in 2001 to 435 in 2005 (an 18.2% increase). In 2005, forty percent of initially licensed principals completed their training in programs in which faculty produce virtually no publications nor generate much research activity. Five of the seven newly approved programs are small programs run by one or two full time faculty member with significantly larger faculty teaching loads and little research productivity.

Faculty Diversity. Although McCarthy and Kuh found progress toward gender equality in the 1990s (McCarthy & Kuh, 1997) there is still a significant disparity between male and female representation in building-level leadership programs in Indiana. Generally, building administrator preparation programs in Indiana do not reflect the gender diversification of the field reported by Pounder, et. Al (2004) in their study, which stated that 50% of new faculty hires were women. Indiana principal preparation faculty are still predominately White and Male. Only one in five faculty members are female and one in fifteen faculty members are faculty of color. This represents a significant under-representation of minority instructors across programs when in the context of Indiana’s K-12 schools, where 28 percent of students are students of color and there is an equal distribution of males and females. Of significance is
the fact that by far the greatest growth in faculty is in the adjunct and part-time faculty. Disparities are less pronounced with full-time tenure-track faculty, where 35% of faculty members in principal preparation programs are women, as compared to part-time and split time faculty is 28% female. By contrast, 53% of the reported students are female, which is still lower than the national average (Baker, Young, & Orr, 2005). Additionally, the majority of the handful of faculty of color is full-time tenure track. This result is certainly tied to the gender and racial disparity in administrative positions, particularly the superintendency, but if amount of experience in K-12 experience is most highly valued, the data here suggests that value orientation will conflict with efforts to diversify faculty.

High numbers of adjunct faculty. In general, Indiana’s programs are marked by their high reliance on adjunct professors (See Appendix A). This is related to the relatively low cost of employing part-time faculty on an as needed basis. The high numbers of adjunct professors in the state surprised even the authors. There are certainly benefits that adjunct professors can bring to leadership instruction, the most important of which may be recent or even concurrent experience in the principal’s office themselves. Murphy (2006) and many others argue that educational leadership programs should always have deep connections to practice. Often adjunct professors provide students with insights into the everyday practice of the principalship they would otherwise not be exposed to in what some might categorize as theory driven programs. Studies show that skilled and relatively permanent adjuncts are highly valued by students (Cohen, Darling-Hammond, & LaPointe, 2006) and Indiana’s faculty has significant amounts of school-based leadership experience. However, the pendulum seems to be swinging far to the practice extreme, with some programs being significantly adjunct driven with little emphasis on understanding and using theories that undergird decisions that educational leaders make every day. This finding led the authors to make the following recommendation to Indiana’s building-level leadership programs (Black, Batson & Poindexter, 2007, p. 174): Maximize the use of full-time faculty and plan for the use of adjunct faculty in ways that enhances program coherence. Programs should report publicly the percentage of instruction delivered by part-time versus full-time faculty.

As of the end of the 2005-2006 academic year, there were are only 21 assistant and associate level full-time faculty members in the State of Indiana’s building-level leadership programs. Full-time faculty members are intimately tied to program quality and institutional development. They have more at stake and a higher incentive to ensure program quality and a high devotion to the program’s mission and goals. For instance, because of the high number of adjunct professors, some programs are moving toward syllabus templates or fixed syllabi for all their courses. While this type of syllabus creation is perhaps more efficient and can ensure greater alignment to standards, it may eliminate the very benefit of adjunct professors, their individual knowledge and experience in educational settings. Further, there is higher accountability for full-time faculty in the tenure process. Full-time faculty can provide more of a
connection to the national field and debate surrounding their specialty, thus providing the most up-to-date information to aid school leaders.

While there are some subjects that may inherently lend themselves to adjunct professors, the core of the leadership curriculum, such as introductory courses on leadership should be taught by full-time faculty as frequently as possible. The data from this study shows that nearly 90 percent of Indiana’s full-time faculty members have school administrative experience with the non-experienced full-time members teaching specialty courses such as educational law or economics. Thus, Indiana’s full-time faculty are also well equipped to provide “practical” experience, but are also versed in the underlying theories and nationwide efforts at reform. Yet, many programs are run with one to two full-time faculty members. Thus, programs should systematically evaluate the efficacy of their adjunct instructors and not just their efficiency.

**Conclusion**

Given the increased attention to the future of educational leadership, data regarding the individuals solely responsible for preparing educational leaders seems in short supply. In order to determine the leadership practices and organizational factors which promote compassion, understanding, dialogue and action within schools, it is important to know who is leading our future leaders in the educational leadership preparation coursework. While this study was limited to a single Midwestern state, this analysis will likely resonate with many other preparation program representatives feeling similar pressures in different states. We hope similar faculty investigations are completed in other states and call on scholars in the educational leadership field to once again conduct a national investigation into the educational leadership professorate. If the field of educational leadership preparation is ever to achieve the long sought-after goal of becoming a true profession, an important first step is understanding who are the members that teach the courses and direct the educational leadership programs. At least in Indiana, the profession of building-level leadership preparation is largely made up of experienced, well educated, white, male, part-time professors.
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Appendix A
Faculty Distribution Across Positions and Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Tenure Track (Full-Time)</th>
<th>Non-Tenure Track (Full-Time)</th>
<th>Part-Time</th>
<th>Split-Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>Clinical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program 3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program 4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program 5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program 6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program 7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program 8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program 9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program 10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program 11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program 12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program 13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program 14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program 15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program 16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program 17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>